	1	BEFURE THE
	2	CALIFORNIA SECRETARY OF STATE
	3	CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
	4	
5		
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION HEARING
	10	DAY 2
	11	
	12	Held at Honnold/Mudd Library, Founders Room
	13	Claremont University Consortium 800 N. Dartmouth Avenue
	14	Claremont, California
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	FRI DAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2011
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	Reported by:
	25	Susan M. Patterson, CSR No. 2448
		Susan M Dattorson CSD

1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	CALIFORNIA CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION:
4	COMMI SSI ONERS:
5	Michael Ward, Chair
6	Connie Galambos Malloy, Vice Chair Gabino T. Aguirre Angelo Ancheta
7	Vi ncent Barabba Mari a Bl anco
8	Cynthia Dai Michelle DiGuilio
9	Stanley Forbes Lilbert "Gil" Ontai
10	M. Andre Parvenu Jeanne Raya
11	Jodie Filkins Webber Peter Yao
12	STAFF:
13	Kirk Miller, Legal Counsel
14	Dan Claypool, Executive Director Janeece Sargis, Administrative Assistant
15	Rob Wilcox, Communications Director
16	
17	PRESENTERS:
18	THEOLINE INC.
19	Karin Mac Donald, Q2 Data & Research
20	Sarah Rubin, Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS
21	Charlotte Chorneau, Center for
22	Collaborative Policy, CSUS
23	
24	
25	

2		
3		Page
4	FULL COMMISSION MEETING, OPEN SESSION	
5	1 Opening Remarks	323
6	2 Executive Director's Report	329
7	3 Public Comment	347
8	4 Vote	350
9	5 Panel Discussion, Budget and Finance Director Position	352
10	6 Public Comment	363
11	7 Vote	365
12	8 Panel Discussion, Various Topics:	
13	A Cal endars	365
14	B Accessing Public Comments	368
15		372
16		
17	D Blackberries and Email	374
18	E Governance	379
19	9 Legal advisory Committee Report	390
20	10 Panel Discussion, Meeting Minutes Approval	417
21	11 Vote	419
22	12 Panel Discussion, Discontinuation of Meeting Minutes	420
23	13 Public Comment	424
24	14 Vote	424
25	14 VULE	423

	1	INDEX (CONTINUED)	
	2		
	3		Page
	4	FULL COMMISSION MEETING, OPEN SESSION	
5		15 Technical Advisory Committee Report	429
	6	16 Public Comment	500
	7	17 Vote	504
	8	18 Vote	511
	9	19 Public Comment	527
	10	20 Vote	529
	11	21 Public Comment	533
	12	22 Vote	534
	13		
	14	23 Vote	540
	15	24 Public Comment	564
	16	25 Public Comment	584
	17	26 Vote	593
	18	27 Presenters:	
	19	Sarah Rubin, Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS	601
	20	Charlotte Chorneau, Center for	601
	21	Collaborative Policy, CSUS	(E2
	22	28 Vote	652
	23	29 Public Comment	661
	24	30 Vote	662
	25	31 Vote	671
		Susan M. Dattorson, CSD	

	1	INDEX (CONTINUED)	
	2		
	3		Page
	4	FULL COMMISSION MEETING, OPEN SESSION	
5			
	6	32 Public Comment	675
	7	33 Adjournment	675
	8		
	9		
	10		
	11		
	12		
	13		
	14		
	15		
	16		
	17		
	18		
	19		
	20		
	21		
	22		
	23		
	24		
	25		

1	Claremont, California February 11, 2011
2	9:07 a.m.
3	- 0 -
4	PROCEEDINGS
5	
6	CHAIRMAN WARD: Good morning. Welcome to the
7	February 11th, 2011 open session for the California
8	Redistricting Commission, day two.
9	And let's go ahead and start off with
10	roll call.
11	MS. SARGIS: Commission Aguirre?
12	COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Here.
13	MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Ancheta?
14	COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Here.
15	MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Barabba?
16	COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Here.
17	MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Blanco?
18	COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Here.
19	MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Dai?
20	COMMISSIONER DAI: Here.
21	MS. SARGIS: Commissioner DiGuilio?
22	COMMISSIONER DiGUILLO: Here.
23	MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Filkins Webber?
24	COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Here.
25	MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Forbes?

1	COMMISSIONER FORBES: Here.
2	MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Galambos Malloy?
3	COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Here.
4	MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Ontai?
5	COMMISSIONER ONTAL: Here.
6	MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Parvenu?
7	COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Here.
8	MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Raya?
9	COMMISSIONER RAYA: Here.
10	MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Ward?
11	CHAIRMAN WARD: Here.
12	MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Yao?
13	COMMISSIONER YAO: Here.
14	CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you, Janeece.
15	Real quickly before we start this
16	morning, just a matter of order is, on the microphones,
17	just remember that after you speak to shut them off, and
18	if you see this kind of a thing it's just reminding you
19	to shut them off. Because what happens is if two are
20	on, the third person who is speaking, their mike isn't
21	on so the audio might not be picking them up. I guess
22	that happened often yesterday. So we'll pay good
23	attention to that, and the Vice will help us point that
24	out.
25	It's great to see so many out in the

- 1 gallery today. Thank you so much for joining us and
- 2 your interest in our work.
- 3 On January 13th the Commission passed a
- 4 motion to place a five-minute time limit on public
- 5 comments, so I'd like to go ahead and institute that
- 6 today during today's session and at this time open
- 7 microphone for public comment for agendized or
- 8 non-agendized items. If you'd like to address the
- 9 Commission please step forward to the microphone.
- 10 AUDI ENCE MEMBER: Good morning.
- 11 Commissioners. I didn't even write my notes on this one
- 12 yet at this bright hour. I'm Bruce Campbell from West
- 13 LA area. And, first, I thought it was a little odd
- 14 comment about all the people in the gallery or galley,
- 15 whatever you called it. While Claremont makes sense if
- one has wheels and is available in the daytime, but I
- 17 hope you plan hearings more oriented so that people
- 18 taking public transportation can get to the hearings,
- 19 too. If I took public transportation I'd probably have
- 20 to get on a bus at 4:00 a.m. and maybe Greyhound or
- something could get me here maybe.
- So I mainly want to mention a few things,
- 23 places I used to live. I noticed that Santa Barbara is
- 24 in the same regional grouping as LA County and I know
- 25 that Santa Barbara County can't stand LA County and thus

- 1 probably wouldn't get much input from
- 2 Santa Barbara County unless you had -- it would be good
- 3 to have a hearing probably in the city of Santa Barbara,
- 4 but if you don't have one in Ventura County possibly
- 5 Carpinteria, but then that would get into the harder to
- 6 get there by public transportation. So I urge one of
- 7 these hearings in Santa Barbara.
- 8 And also then there's the -- also the
- 9 north coast is a distinct entity if you look at
- 10 topographically and the rivers. Anyway, here's the
- 11 mountains and the rivers flow to the ocean and was quite
- 12 a -- it used to be a stronghold of timber and fishing
- 13 industry and all, and it's quite a unique area and
- 14 they're somewhat cut off. So I suggest a hearing, if
- 15 not in Humboldt County, probably between Fortuna or
- 16 Eureka or Arcada, but if you don't have one in Humboldt
- 17 County I'd suggest looking at Willits which is a
- 18 reasonable size town in the northern part of
- 19 Mendoci no County.
- 20 And then -- I guess I haven't lived in
- 21 the San Fernando Valley since I was three years old, but
- 22 I realize there was something fishy in trying to avoid
- 23 having a Latino district in the San Fernando Valley
- 24 during the last redistricting, so either a hearing --
- 25 probably a hearing in the San Fernando Valley, but at

- 1 least a real good transit access from the Valley to
- 2 wherever the hearing might be.
- 3 So those are my main suggestions for the
- 4 day. Thank you.
- 5 CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you.
- 6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good morning. My name is
- 7 Ellen Taylor. I'm president of the League of Women
- 8 Voters in Claremont. And we are sending observers here.
- 9 We will be not be speaking, but we will be watching what
- 10 you are doing and how you are doing it. And I just
- 11 wanted to explain the presence of the -- we're probably
- 12 all gray-haired ladies, although we don't have to be.
- Thank you.
- 14 AUDI ENCE MEMBER: My name is John Kopp from
- 15 Riverside County. I spoke yesterday but I didn't know
- 16 people were going to be making their pitches, and since
- 17 I'm not sure if I'm going to be able the attend one of
- 18 the outreach sessions, depending on where they are, I
- 19 thought I'd make my pitch today.
- 20 I've read the criteria, Section 2,
- 21 Article 21, of the California Constitution which gives
- the marching orders to the Commission.
- 23 Riverside County, I did not live there
- 24 when the last reapportionment took place, but,
- anecdotally from a number of people who have been

- 1 candidates for state offices, assembly and senate as
- 2 well as congress, the Commission exists precisely
- 3 because deals such as took place in the year 2000 did in
- 4 fact take place. For concessions obtained by one
- 5 political party, other concessions were given by that
- 6 same party to the other. And, as it turned out,
- 7 Riverside County was volcanized. It contains six
- 8 assembly districts, four state senate districts, and
- 9 four congressional districts, only one of which is
- 10 contained entirely within the county borders.
- I did an analysis from the census
- 12 figures, and the total US population is 307,006,550.
- 13 When you divide that by 435 members of Congress, it
- 14 turns out that each congressional representative should
- be representing seven-hundred-five-plus-thousand people.
- 16 From that same census comes 2,125,440 people living in
- 17 Riverside County. And when you divide that by the ideal
- 18 of 705,762 people per congressional district, you come
- 19 out that Riverside County as a single entity, which
- should be respected, should obtain, simply numerical,
- 3.011 congressional members, and they could be contained
- 22 entirely within the boundaries of that county.
- 23 As to the California legislature,
- 24 California's population of 36,457,549 people means that
- each of the senate seats should represent about 911,000

- 1 people, and each assembly district roughly half of that,
- 2 or 455,000 people. With Riverside County's 2,125,440
- 3 people, that means there should be approximately 2.33
- 4 senate seats and 4.66 assembly seats that could be
- 5 accommodated entirely within the integrity of the county
- 6 boundary.
- 7 So I appreciate the time.
- 8 CHAI RMAN WARD: Thank you.
- 9 With no one else approaching the mike,
- 10 we'll go ahead and thank you for all the comments that
- 11 came in this morning. The League of Women Voters
- 12 actually had a really -- a well-spoken gentleman that
- 13 participated in the communication subcommittee
- 14 yesterday, just great comments and fantastic thoughts
- 15 that he shared with us. So we certainly appreciate your
- 16 participation and being here with us. Thank you.
- 17 And it is worth noting that our average
- 18 attendance was approximately one in Sacramento, so this
- 19 is a celebration because it's a 700-fold increase from
- 20 normal. So that's certainly worth it. Thank you for
- 21 showing up and being with us today.
- 22 Point of order for the Commission is we
- 23 called a bid of an audible last night and in feedback
- 24 that was received from the subcommittees, understanding
- 25 that the two-hour allotment for briefing the main

- 1 Commission might not be necessary in all cases. So in
- 2 looking at it last night the thought is that we should
- 3 be able to -- if you don't need that full amount of time
- 4 I'd like to propose that we go ahead and push the
- 5 schedule forward, which would mean that some
- 6 subcommittees might present today that were scheduled to
- 7 present tomorrow. And that would put us out, conclude
- 8 business at approximately noon, if not slightly before,
- 9 tomorrow. Are there any comments from the Commission
- 10 that have concern about that?
- 11 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Commissioner Ward,
- 12 based on the original presentation, I know that Karin
- 13 Mac Donald has an airline flight that didn't anticipate
- 14 coming in until 1:00 o'clock, so I don't know if we can
- 15 be switched around, if you want to bump someone in the
- 16 earlier time slot so we can remain in the afternoon time
- 17 sl ot.
- 18 CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you. That's a great
- 19 comment. For those reasons we're going to leave the
- 20 afternoon set as it is, but the morning might flow a
- 21 little faster. So I'll be asking for flexibility with
- 22 the agenda again, unless anyone has -- okay, great.
- 23 We'll go ahead and move forward, then, and we'll turn
- 24 the microphone over to Mr. Claypool for executive
- 25 di rector update.

1 MR. CLAYPOOL: Thank you. First, and most 2 importantly, I would like to thank the 3 Claremont Universities for the use of this facility, and 4 in particular John McDonald and the Claremont University 5 Consortium Management Team for their exceptional efforts They've provided us with everything that 6 on our behalf. 7 we've requested, and the support for us during all the 8 meetings is an example of how these venues should be 9 run. They've been great. 10 (Appl ause.) It's been a little over a month since I 11 12 was selected by you to be your executive director, and 13 it's been a steep learning curve. In the first interim 14 period between the first and second Sacramento sessions 15 my focus was on identifying the staff that we needed and 16 interviewing them and hiring them, establishing our 17 K Street office space in Sacramento, and creating a plan 18 for moving towards the completion of our mutual goal of 19 redistricting California's assembly, state, 20 congressional, and Board of Equalization districts as 21 Proposition 11 and 20 intend. 22 In the second eleven days between our 23 last Sacramento session and our meeting here in 24 Claremont I've continued in my efforts to complete our 25 staffing and to move towards a plan for redistricting

- 1 that reflects your vision as it's been communicated to
- 2 me. In doing so I've spent the last six days working
- 3 with three staff members: Raul Villanueva, our office
- 4 manager; Janeece Sargis, our direct aid to you, and
- 5 Christina Shupe, our administrative liaison to the state
- 6 agencies assisting us.
- 7 And I've had two full days with our chief
- 8 counsel and director of communications to accomplish the
- 9 following: We established a dialogue and meetings with
- 10 the Center for Collaborative Policy and linked two
- 11 members of the technical committee with the senior
- 12 management team. We also had numerous conversations
- 13 with Karin Mac Donald and the director of the
- 14 Statewide Database. Together our plan for outreach and
- 15 hearing input was outlined and is the topic of
- 16 presentations that we're having during this session.
- 17 I also met with a staff person from the
- 18 speaker's office and a staff person from the republican
- 19 caucus, both who noted that there was joint agreement
- 20 and effort to provide a statewide database and public
- 21 access to redistricting software as required by
- 22 Propositions 11 and 20. Both offer the full support of
- their respective offices to this Commission's efforts.
- We also opened up dialogue with the
- 25 Department of Finance and received instruction on how to

- 1 request the current \$1 million augmentation that's in
- 2 this year's budget. In that instruction I was
- 3 encouraged to seek any augmentation beyond what a
- 4 statement of need -- beyond that with a statement of
- 5 need for the additional funds that showed what each pool
- 6 of funds would pay for and in what fiscal year the
- 7 expenditure would occur. The work of creating an
- 8 overall expenditure plan by fiscal year has already
- 9 begun with the estimation of staffing costs. As soon as
- 10 the Commission gives preliminary approval of a plan that
- 11 outlines the public hearing and outreach process at this
- 12 session, we'll have the framework to put an overall
- 13 budget in place that would be the basis of our statement
- 14 of needs which will include all the elements anticipated
- 15 to complete the redistricting process. Our plan is to
- 16 provide the completed statement of need at the
- 17 Sacramento capital session following approval of the
- 18 final plan for public hearings and outreach.
- 19 In the week following the approval of the
- 20 statement of need we intend to submit the request to
- 21 release the \$1 million in the current budget from the
- 22 Department of Finance, using our statement of need as
- 23 the basis of justification for that augmentation. We
- 24 also intend to open up a dialogue with the legislative
- 25 Leadership and with the Department of Finance to request

- 1 the remainder of the funding that we anticipate needing.
- 2 Again, we used the statement of needs there as the basis
- 3 for those requests.
- 4 As a precursor to the overall plan we've
- 5 requested budget information and justifications,
- 6 including contingency funds from the chief counsel, the
- 7 communications director, and potential primary
- 8 contractors including the Department of General
- 9 Services, the Center for Collaborative Policy, and the
- 10 di rector of the Statewi de Database.
- 11 We also have administrative staff
- 12 establishing a database for staff costs, including
- 13 office expenses, travel, sick leave, vacation leave, and
- 14 all the different costs that go with your staff.
- 15 Finally, the chief counsel and
- 16 communications director and staff have made inquiries
- 17 about the estimated costs for vendor services, such as
- 18 outside counsel, VRA attorney estimates, redistricting
- 19 consultants, IT maintenance, web design, and desktop
- 20 servi ces.
- 21 I've begun the required policy statements
- 22 for the process required by Section 8253.5 of the Voters
- 23 First Act, which states the Commission shall establish a
- 24 clear criteria for the hiring and removal of staff,
- 25 communication protocols, and a code of conduct. The

- 1 basic policy for these items will be completed in the
- 2 week following this current session. With your
- 3 permission, I would like to distribute them to the chief
- 4 counsel and the communications director and then provide
- 5 them to the designated commissioners on the finance and
- 6 administrative advisory committee for review and edit
- 7 prior to the Sacramento capital session. These policies
- 8 will follow the Commission's procedure in hiring the
- 9 current staff and will presume a similar methodology for
- 10 removing staff as the need arises.
- 11 The communication protocol will give
- 12 staff a framework in how we should communicate, both
- 13 internally and with the public. It should have a
- 14 refined methodology for communications with you, and the
- 15 staff will work with you and from us to you during the
- 16 interim periods between business meetings.
- 17 I'm hoping for some direction from you
- 18 during this session on how we can best communicate our
- 19 activities to you between sessions so that we can reduce
- 20 some of the miscommunications that have previously
- 21 occurred. The code of conduct will be simple and
- 22 direct. Your staff should serve you in a manner that
- 23 reflects their respect for your commitment to this
- 24 process, and they should refrain from any action or
- 25 activity that would be detrimental to your efforts.

1	We've also completed the hiring of the
2	two administrative assistants, and they began their work
3	last week following the Sacramento session. Both have
4	settled into their respective roles, as I previously
5	noted.
6	The communications director began on
7	Monday of this week and immediately contributed to our
8	process by reaching out to the director of the
9	Department of General Services to assist us in resolving
10	the issue of our delegated authority.
11	Our chief counsel began full-time on
12	Tuesday of this week and is settling in. Prior to that,
13	however, he assisted by providing legal counsel on a
14	variety of issues requested by the commissioners and
15	assisted me in clarifying meeting issues with the Center
16	for Collaborative policy on Tuesday. A suggestion was
17	made to me that you, the commissioners, need to have a
18	staffing chart that clarifies the respective roles and
19	activities of your staff. I've requested the flow chart
20	from Raul Villanueva, your office manager, and he's in
21	the process of completing and forwarding that document
22	to me. I hope to have it for you prior to the end of
23	this session.
24	Our lack of delegated authority is
25	hindering our procurement of material and services and

- 1 our ability to make contracts, including those approved
- 2 in the last session. Last week I was told that the
- 3 primary -- or last night I was told that the primary
- 4 issue holding up our authority is the lack of a fully
- 5 trained budget officer or equivalent that would qualify
- 6 to be responsible for the delegation of that authority
- 7 to us. As a result, I've asked staff to specifically
- 8 target retired annuitants that have the type of training
- 9 and experience necessary to help us qualify for our
- 10 delegated authority. I've also asked staff to request
- 11 from DGS staff the typical service level and salary
- 12 range for individuals with this type of experience to
- 13 aid in our search.
- 14 In our initial search only five resumes
- 15 were received. Three were qualified for interviews.
- 16 One was clearly unqualified following the interview.
- 17 One had the basic skills but is underqualified. And the
- 18 most qualified candidate declined, stating that the
- 19 amount offered for the position was insufficient.
- In the meantime alternative means have
- 21 been identified to contract for services, including
- 22 interagency agreements with the CSU Sacramento to try
- 23 and secure IT and non-IT services while waiting for our
- 24 delegated purchasing authority. The efforts remain
- 25 ongoing. In addition, we are also partnering with DGS

- 1 staff for contracting and procurement. It's a temporary
- 2 alternative plan while waiting for resolution to our
- 3 delegated authority. This has allowed us to pursue the
- 4 procurement of office supplies beyond the \$100
- 5 originally allocated. It may also be an avenue for IT
- 6 services and products including the purchase of badly
- 7 needed software and accessing vendors for website and
- 8 office IT needs.
- 9 Our Sacramento office has been outfitted
- 10 with computers for staff, courtesy of the Secretary of
- 11 State's office, and the Secretary of State staff have
- 12 completed the installation of phone lines and a fax
- 13 line. Each commissioner was given a contact list in
- 14 their packets that indicates the staff and commissioner
- 15 contact numbers. A system for accepting and processing
- 16 travel expense claims and per diems has been set in
- 17 place. That will facilitate the filing and
- 18 recordkeeping and intake process that we need to
- 19 accommodate DGS requirements. Documentation needed from
- 20 individuals to make payment has been identified, and CRC
- 21 staff are in training to take the process over from the
- 22 Secretary of State's office.
- 23 A central calendar was developed and
- 24 tested -- and has been tested and initiated with
- 25 commissioner participation. Instructions for the use

- 1 are being developed, and Christina Shupe of your staff
- 2 has been designated as a staff person to assist you with
- 3 this process. Instructions for the use of electronic
- 4 calendars will be distributed to you by email. After
- 5 several assurances that this service was already in
- 6 place, the DGS travel website is finally capable of
- 7 allowing us to book and pay for hotel and rental cars.
- 8 The final travel service for airline tickets is supposed
- 9 to be in place within a few days. An email will be sent
- 10 to each of you explaining how to use this service as
- 11 soon as we know that it's all in place for you.
- Business card prototypes have been
- 13 finalized and the costs have been identified. Templates
- 14 are ready for commissioner review and will be emailed
- out to each of you for comment. DGS can also design a
- 16 customized card with the Commission logo if the
- 17 Commission is willing to pay the extra cost. A cost
- 18 breakdown for the additional cost will also be provided
- in the prototype email.
- We've established the 800 public line,
- 21 and it's been transferred to our CRC offices, and we are
- 22 now taking all public inquiries and questions directly.
- 23 The volume is low at this time but it will pick up when
- 24 we start taking public comment. Staff augmentation may
- 25 be necessary to cover the phones and the website

- 1 comments if the volume accelerates to the point where
- 2 our current staff member can't keep up with the response
- 3 and perform their primary duty. We have discussed the
- 4 provision of student interns and volunteers with CSU
- 5 Sacramento's employment service as a low-cost
- 6 alternative to covering these responsibilities.
- 7 Blackberries are also -- are almost
- 8 available, and the Secretary of State's office is moving
- 9 quickly to purchase the phones and place a maintenance
- 10 and service agreement in place to manage this resource.
- 11 We anticipate that the phones will be available to those
- 12 of you who requested them by the first of next week. We
- 13 will provide them to the commissioners once we determine
- 14 a feasible way to deliver the phones.
- 15 So this is all the things that have been
- 16 done in the last eleven days on your behalf. I will --
- 17 I promise that I'm going to set in place a process for
- 18 making sure that you know what we're doing in the
- 19 interim in the future, because I realize that there was
- 20 probably a lot of concern that maybe we were asleep back
- 21 there, but we weren't.
- Some of the impediments, as a recap, that
- 23 have really stood in our way has certainly been the lack
- 24 of staff from January 24th through the 31st, not getting
- our computer phone lines in place until January 26th,

- 1 the procurement -- the \$100 procurement limit. And our
- 2 inability to purchase IT services has hurt. And
- 3 numerous issues with Google apps have been a problem to
- 4 us. But the Secretary of State's office continues, I
- 5 have to say continues to be an instant resource to us
- 6 whenever we need them, and they've been great.
- 7 I have at this time four recommendations
- 8 that I would like the Commission to consider. I'd like
- 9 to end the 24-hour turnaround for stenography services.
- 10 During the prior session we missed this 24-hour
- 11 turnaround for posting on two occasions and no one
- 12 complained that it hadn't been posted within the 24-hour
- 13 period. The Secretary of State's office simply was
- 14 unable to post them up in that time. If we drop back to
- 15 a five- to seven-day posting we can reduce the cost by
- 16 almost one half, and those costs are significant to you.
- 17 Right now we pay about \$10 a page. Yesterday we had
- 18 about 300 pages worth of transcription. So it's just a
- 19 significant reduction in our costs if we can do that.
- I would also like to recommend that we
- 21 continue live-streaming to the extent possible but
- 22 accept venues where live-streaming can only be done from
- 23 one meeting or not at all, which is the case here. In
- 24 the cases where we can't live-stream we can post the
- 25 video of the hearing as soon as practicable and provide

- 1 a link to the venue similar to the one provided by the
- 2 live-streaming venues. We could also post the
- 3 circumstance on our website to alert viewers to this
- 4 issue. But we are going to run into places where
- 5 they're not going to be able to live-stream two meetings
- 6 at once, and I believe we will run into venues where
- 7 they may not be able to live-stream at all because they
- 8 won't have the broadband for it.
- 9 I'd like to end the paper copies on the
- 10 public comments to the commissioners, and I believe you
- 11 are already going online to look at the public comments.
- 12 In its place we will always link you to our website
- 13 where the comments have been swept and cataloged for
- 14 your review. This is going to be particularly important
- 15 as we have greater participation in our meetings, where
- 16 physical copies of these comments will be problematic or
- 17 impossible given the volume. The transition to a
- 18 paperless system will be easier if we initiate it now
- 19 while the volume is relatively light.
- 20 Finally, I'd like you to consider giving
- 21 me the authority to increase the wage scale for the
- 22 allocated budget officer position to reach a level of
- 23 pay sufficient to attract an individual that will meet
- 24 the Department of General Services requirement. I hope
- 25 to have the information as to what this level will be

- 1 before the end of this session, but we need that
- 2 delegated authority in place. And if the only issue is
- 3 that we have to have somebody with the requisite
- 4 training and knowledge that they require in order to
- 5 push that button, I think that is something that will
- 6 pail huge dividends.
- 7 Thank you.
- 8 CHAIRMAN WARD: Any questions from the panel?
- 9 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yes. I really
- 10 appreciate all the cost saving.
- I had one question on your recommendation
- 12 about going to a five-day posting of the transcripts
- 13 instead of a 24-hour turnaround. I don't know if this
- 14 is a question. I think that makes sense now but perhaps
- 15 we come back and revisit it as we get to the point where
- 16 we're taking comments about -- when we go back out,
- 17 present maps and receive comments. Those sessions,
- 18 we're going to be turning things around very quickly,
- 19 and in order to maximize public participation we may
- 20 want to go back to 24-hour posting. So that's just one
- 21 thing. I don't know what my fellow commissioners think
- 22 about that, but I'd like to keep some flexibility there.
- 23 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: A similar
- 24 question. There's such a dramatic difference between 24
- 25 hours and seven days so I was also wondering what would

- 1 be the cost savings with a 48-hour turnaround time. Are
- 2 there any kind of incremental options we could consider?
- 3 MR. CLAYPOOL: Absolutely. And the difference
- 4 with the Sacramento costs -- and I can't speak to the
- 5 cost here -- but the difference in the Sacramento costs
- 6 were, if we went to, say, 48 hours they would drop to \$9
- 7 a page, and if we went to three to five days it would
- 8 drop to some figure approximating \$7, and then if we
- 9 went to five to seven it would drop to like \$5 a page.
- 10 This is always an option for us to reconsider and to
- 11 step back up to it. If we start getting comments from
- 12 individuals that it's just not convenient or if you
- 13 start looking for those transcripts and it's not helpful
- 14 to have this policy, we can take the cost back on and we
- 15 can make it -- what I would recommend in this case,
- 16 however, is that we plan a contingent fund as we budget
- 17 for what we're going to do to accommodate that increase
- 18 if we need it, again, under the theory that no one is
- 19 going to care if we give the money back, but they will
- 20 have an objection to giving us the money when we need it
- 21 at that time.
- 22 COMMISSIONER YAO: Do we know who the users of
- 23 these transcripts are? Do we know who the
- 24 transcripts of these -- I'm sorry. Do we know who the
- 25 users of these transcripts are?

1	MR. CLAYPOOL: We have some indication that
2	certainly certainly the users are in this room
3	because most of the people who are involved with
4	watching us, as well as yourselves, will go back to the
5	transcripts periodically to ensure that they've
6	understood a point, or when we've gone back to make sure
7	we knew how we voted. And it's much more convenient
8	than going to the video streaming, which, as I've been
9	told, has no fast forward function on it, so if you want
10	to remember something you've got to go through the
11	entire process.
12	But we don't have any mechanism for
13	tracking who is actually going onto that website and
14	reading these transcripts, other than those individuals
15	who have written to us and have either said, "The
16	transcripts are very helpful to us" and there haven't
17	been a lot of comments, but we received those and
18	those individuals who have come on and said there was an
19	error, or we think there's an error, and that was in one
20	case where there was a clarification and we went back to
21	the transcriber and we made that change. It wasn't a
22	major error. It was an attribution to one commissioner
23	where it had actually been another commissioner that
24	made the statement. We reviewed the video and then we
25	made the change. So that's what we know as far as who

- 1 is using the transcripts.
- 2 COMMISSIONER YAO: When I heard the cost at
- 3 yesterday's transcript cost of \$3,000, I don't know
- 4 whether there's a simpler process of doing it. Perhaps
- 5 putting markers on the video and maybe coming up with
- 6 post-meeting discussion topic or agendas that would
- 7 allow us to get back to the video as a long-term
- 8 solution as compared to the transcript, because the
- 9 video audio by far is the permanent record, is the
- 10 actual record as compared to the transcript itself.
- 11 MR. CLAYPOOL: The one comment I would make,
- 12 Commissioner Yao, to that is that our meeting minutes
- 13 are very succinct, because we have the transcripts and
- 14 so we use that as the official record of what's occurred
- 15 here and then we reference our meeting minutes to that.
- 16 And we do have a lot of individuals -- I should say it's
- 17 a perception that we have a lot of individuals who will
- 18 go to the transcripts because it's easier to see what's
- 19 occurred at a certain point. So it does have a function
- 20 that the Commission has to consider in the long term.
- 21 It is a major expense but it provides a point of
- 22 clarification to the public that I think is appreciated.
- 23 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Is it possible to add to
- 24 the video the ability to fast-forward it and bookmark it
- 25 as Peter has suggested?

- 1 MR. CLAYPOOL: I don't know that, and that's
- 2 something that we'll look into and do or find out what
- 3 that cost is. But that will be the issue: Will the
- 4 incremental cost of adding that service be more than the
- 5 incremental cost of having transcripts.
- 6 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Sure, but we cut the
- 7 transcript cost by a factor of half. It would eliminate
- 8 the need for the 24-hour turnaround. We could still
- 9 have the five-day turnaround. But as far as if someone
- 10 wanted instant recall, if we're able to bookmark it and
- 11 to fast-forward it, we could ask them to use the video.
- MR. CLAYPOOL: We're making a note and we'll
- 13 find out what it costs.
- 14 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I think this is a
- 15 technology problem. It's actually pretty easy to solve
- 16 and it should be a lot cheaper. So I think if we as a
- 17 Commission can agree that if the video can be more
- 18 manageable and that becomes our permanent record, let's
- 19 save the cost on the transcripts.
- 20 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I would only add that I
- 21 wouldn't use the current interest in the records today
- 22 to what it might be a month from now, because as we get
- 23 closer and closer and start revealing direction, the
- 24 interest and the specificity of the comments will become
- of much higher interest. We should not remove something

- 1 that we can't later add in.
- 2 CHAIRMAN WARD: Mr. Claypool, there was an
- 3 issue about having the transcript certified before
- 4 they're posted. I understand that the transcripts were
- 5 being posted without some kind of certification mark or
- 6 seal or something like that that actually makes them an
- 7 official record. Is that something that you're aware of
- 8 or that you've looked into?
- 9 MR. CLAYPOOL: As I understood it, there was
- 10 an issue that at least one transcript had been posted
- 11 up. We pay for the certification, so I believe that was
- 12 simply an error in not placing that certification on the
- 13 document. It wasn't that we had placed an uncertified
- 14 document on it. It was a procedural issue, as I
- 15 understood. But I'd like to check with the staff in
- 16 Sacramento and come back to you with more information on
- 17 that as well.
- 18 COMMISSIONER YAO: Shall we put this
- 19 transcript issue to bed? I think for the time being I
- 20 can live with the five-day turnaround as compared to the
- 21 24-hour turnaround, and I think we're at liberty to
- 22 increase, or shorten the turnaround if we feel that five
- 23 days is too long. So that's my preference at this point
- 24 in time.
- 25 CHAIRMAN WARD: Is that a motion?

- 1 COMMISSIONER YAO: I will move that we follow
- 2 our executive director's recommendation to increase the
- 3 turnaround time from 24 hours to five days at this point
- 4 in time.
- 5 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Second.
- 6 CHAIRMAN WARD: Can I amend that motion to a
- 7 five- to seven-day turnaround?
- 8 COMMISSIONER YAO: Yes.
- 9 CHAIRMAN WARD: Okay. So having heard that
- 10 seconded, we'll go ahead and just do a hand vote, after
- 11 we open it to public comment.
- 12 Is there any public comment regarding
- 13 transcription turnaround time?
- 14 AUDI ENCE MEMBER: Yeah. I use it quite
- 15 frequently on my computer to search, find out, no
- 16 disparagement intended, but what the rascals are doing.
- 17 And my particular search engine allows me to search for
- 18 particular words, "vote," so on, so I can speed through
- 19 and find what I want. So does my -- when I view it on
- 20 the web the ability to fast-forward is there, but I
- 21 think that's a vehicle of my search engine as opposed to
- the Commission's webcast.
- I seriously would object to a five-to
- 24 seven-day turnaround. I could live with 48 or maybe
- even 36 hours as a member of the public, but I think

1 going five to seven days is far too long. 2 John Kopp, my name. 3 CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you. 4 AUDI ENCE MEMBER: Hi, Kathay Feng with 5 California Common Cause. Good morning. 6 We have actually been talking with a 7 number of organizations about the right balance between 8 providing greater public involvement and transparency 9 but also, frankly, trying to keep the costs down. 10 we think that the current proposal to consider a 11 five-day to seven-day turnaround is a sensible one, 12 given the fact that you are going to have live-streaming 13 or audio available that is not only available at the 14 time that the Commission is meeting but immediately 15 available on the web for people to peruse if they want 16 to go back and look for the testimony, since all the 17 information that you need is there. It's a matter of 18 making it more easily searchable. So I think it makes 19 sense to put some bookmarks in and also provide the 20 minutes as quickly as possible. But we think this is 21 the right balance. 22 We also want to take heed, though, of the 23 correct suggestion from Commissioner Blanco that there 24 are different phases of input. And while it may feel

Susan M. Patterson, CSR 9461 Charleville Blvd, Ste 304, Beverly Hills, CA 90212 (310) 425-5716

like there are not a whole lot of people listening

25

- 1 during the business phase of the Commission, as you all
- 2 go into the input phase where you're listening to people
- 3 testify about their communities, you're going to have a
- 4 lot of hearings and there will be a lot more people, I
- 5 hope, in the hearings. But that's also acceptable, I
- 6 think, to have pure audio or pure video in the quick
- 7 turnaround phase.
- 8 And then as you move into the next phase
- 9 where maps, draft maps are presented and people are
- 10 commenting, I think that's where you most need to have a
- 11 quicker turnaround for the stenography transcripts,
- 12 particularly because you're going to need to go back to
- 13 those written words and figure out if the maps are
- 14 reflecting what communities have asked for. That
- 15 becomes a tool that is as much useful for the
- 16 Commissioners as it is for the public.
- 17 So we agree with the current proposal,
- 18 and thank you for giving it some very serious
- 19 consideration.
- 20 CHAIRMAN WARD: Any further panel discussion?
- Okay, at this point the motion, as I
- 22 understand, on the floor is to propose to move the
- 23 turnaround time for the transcripts to five to seven
- 24 days, subject to further review at another time. So all
- in favor, raise your hand and say "aye."

1	COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
2	CHAIRMAN WARD: All opposed?
3	And abstain?
4	Okay, so it is.
5	Mr. Claypool, I was unclear in your
6	live-stream comments. In discussing it, we can just do
7	one, a meeting at a time live-stream? And, for example,
8	this week, doing subcommittee meetings, we were able to
9	tape those and we'll post those to the site at a later
10	time. Were you asking for you brought that up as a
11	point that needed consideration.
12	MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes. And this venue is a
13	perfect case in point. You know, this is a
14	state-of-the-art university and they can only give us
15	during your subcommittee meetings live-streaming from
16	one venue. As we start moving out into places where the
17	venues may not be able to provide any live-streaming,
18	then I think that we don't want to eliminate those
19	venues as possible places for us to have our meetings.
20	We just have to be able to inform the public that in
21	this particular case we're going to have to go with
22	videography and then posting it up within 24 hours.
23	My recommendation would be that we you
24	know, ahead of that event, because we're going to try to
25	get ahead of the curve as far as we possibly can on

- 1 letting the public know when we're going to have these
- 2 events, that, when we knew, we could post it with it
- 3 that you won't be able to get this live-streaming. But
- 4 we will try to meet that 24-hour, as practicable, link.
- 5 And I just wanted concurrence that we were all in
- 6 agreement that that's the way we wanted to progress.
- 7 Otherwise, as we start talking with those individuals
- 8 who will be planning our venues, it would require me to
- 9 say, "If you can't give us live-streaming then we can't
- 10 consider you, " and I don't think that's what we want.
- 11 COMMISSIONER DAI: So I just wanted to remind
- 12 the Commission we had extensive discussion about this
- 13 before and we were in general agreement that as long as
- 14 we had audio as a minimum that -- we would try to get
- 15 live-streaming whenever possible, but as long as we have
- 16 audio that would be fine. So unless there's a change in
- 17 that, I think that we would concur.
- 18 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And I think the
- 19 sentiment behind that conversation that we had was that
- 20 the technology is really designed to be an enabler, and
- 21 we don't want it to be a barrier for us to be able to go
- 22 to places where redistricting hasn't reached before. We
- 23 want it to be a way that we can get out as much as
- 24 possible. So I concur with Commissioner Dai's comments.
- 25 I think we're clear on that.

1 CHAIRMAN WARD: Good enough, Mr. Claypool? 2 MR. CLAYPOOL: Absolutely. 3 CHAIRMAN WARD: Okay. Mr. Claypool, I was wondering when did you expect -- did you have any kind 4 5 of projection as to when we might have that budget 6 position filled? I understand it's been reopened 7 It's a currently open position? al ready. 8 MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes, it is. And because we've 9 advertised it we don't have to, as I understand it, go 10 back through the seven-day process for letting it. 11 We're holding it with the Secretary of State's office as 12 an ongoing position to be filled, and then we'll take 13 the applications. 14 Besides going to the list of retired 15 annuitants, who really will be our best source of a 16 person for this position, we've asked the Department of 17 General Services whether they have any names of retired 18 annuitants they might use that they would recommend, 19 because we thought that this would streamline the 20 process for putting somebody in place that would meet 21 their qualifications, given that they made the 22 recommendation that we hire them. So we're working on 23 that. 24 The one individual who did apply that 25 declined for the position because of the salary

- 1 structure I believe may come back and, if we can
- 2 increase it to that level that we would get a
- 3 recommendation from the Department of General Services
- 4 on this is the level of salary that would be
- 5 commensurate with this position, then may agree that
- 6 that's sufficient to come aboard. And that individual
- 7 is very qualified. The only issue would be making sure
- 8 that she's current in her training, although, as we
- 9 understand it, if her training is behind she can take
- 10 that online.
- 11 So that's our approach, and that's where
- 12 we're headed, but that's what we need. And that was
- only communicated by way -- to us yesterday after about
- 14 three weeks of saying, "What do we need to do?" "What
- 15 do we need to do?" So we finally have what we believe
- 16 is a clear path. But we will continue to also look for
- 17 other alternatives to procuring while we wait to put
- 18 that person in place.
- 19 COMMISSIONER DAI: Dan, I was just wondering
- 20 if -- there was some concern that was expressed at our
- 21 meetings back in Sacramento last month about where the
- 22 position has been posted, and I just wanted to clarify
- 23 if it had been shared with the partner organizations.
- 24 And maybe you can just go through where that position
- 25 has been advertised.

- 1 MR. CLAYPOOL: We -- and in fact yes, the
- 2 concern was that we had only gone through the standard
- 3 State, you know, position of going to the State
- 4 personnel board and posting it. Now, that has always
- 5 been a sufficient manner for finding statewide labor, or
- 6 intra-statewide. But in this particular case we went
- 7 back to our persons of interest list and sent that
- 8 position out through that so that we reached every
- 9 organization that has shown an interest in our endeavor
- 10 and said, "If you know of anybody that is qualified for
- 11 this position we would like to hear." That is how we
- 12 received the name of the one individual who said -- who
- 13 was infinitely qualified but declined on the basis of
- 14 salary. We received it through that process and we
- 15 would do that again.
- 16 COMMISSIONER YAO: I wish the Chair to
- 17 consider tasking the finance and administration
- 18 subcommittee in working with staff to address this issue
- 19 as compared to addressing this issue as an entire
- 20 Committee (sic). I think we can tackle the problem and
- 21 report back to the Committee (sic) in very short order
- 22 on this.
- 23 CHAIRMAN WARD: I believe that's been tasked,
- 24 correct, already? Yes.
- Just being that it was part of his

- 1 report, I just wanted to know where we were at in the
- 2 status of having that posted and where it's at.
- 3 COMMISSIONER YAO: Okay.
- 4 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Well, Dan, I think
- 5 you're suggesting that the Commission grant you some
- 6 authority to basically seek an increase in the scale,
- 7 correct? And that may be to attract this particular
- 8 candidate or others that may be looking at a higher
- 9 range. Is that basically what you're asking the full
- 10 Commission to do?
- 11 MR. CLAYPOOL: I am. That was my original
- 12 request, was to allow me to move up in this scale. But
- 13 as I've sat talking with Kirk here just in passing, also
- 14 the only other issue we have with this is, if we
- 15 identify this candidate, then we have the issue of
- 16 putting them into place. Previous to this it's required
- 17 a full vote of the Commission to place a person onto our
- 18 staff. The next time we're going to have that full
- 19 Commission is going to be in Sacramento. So if we
- 20 identify this person this week and we still couldn't put
- 21 them in place until they got to Sacramento, I don't know
- 22 if there is a way to have them work in good faith. I
- 23 don't know. But I'll identify that and I'll work
- 24 through the finance committee to -- as I identify those
- 25 options.

- 1 COMMISSIONER DAI: Kirk, I have a question
- 2 about whether there is any provision that allows us to
- 3 vote by email as long as we have the information we
- 4 need?
- 5 MR. MILLER: This is a difficult requirement
- 6 that the statute has given us with respect to what ought
- 7 to be an ordinary-course issue. But let me consider
- 8 that. I'm concerned that we may run into the notice
- 9 requirements of a meeting if we have a vote even on what
- 10 is a rather perfunctory item of choosing a staff person.
- 11 But it does look like we're kind of locked in as I read
- 12 this language this morning.
- 13 COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. Because I believe we
- 14 have staffing as an ongoing item on all of our agendas.
- 15 I understand it's probably a place issue, then, right?
- 16 MR. MILLER: I think it is properly noticed,
- 17 so I'm not concerned about it being noticed for the next
- 18 meeting, but rather the problem would be voting in
- 19 between meetings.
- 20 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Excuse me. I have a
- 21 question. Maybe this is for Kirk. I just want to be
- 22 sure I understand two issues that are coming together
- 23 here. If we are -- if we increase the salary for this
- 24 position, then -- but we're still talking about -- I
- 25 have a little concern about then we're talking about one

- 1 candidate and not opening the opportunity to others who
- 2 might not have had interest until you increase the
- 3 sal ary.
- 4 MR. CLAYPOOL: No. And if I was unclear, this
- 5 position is open right now and we're seeking any
- 6 qualified individual that can meet those specifications.
- 7 We have that one individual who I believe would have
- 8 those qualifications, and if that person then said this
- 9 is sufficient, her application would just become one of
- 10 the applications that we would consider within a certain
- 11 range, and then we would make that decision.
- 12 It was just comforting that we had that
- one individual out there and that the only impediment
- 14 appeared to be salary, but it doesn't mean it would be
- 15 the only person we consider.
- 16 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Just a couple of
- 17 questions of clarification for myself. We're talking
- 18 about authorizing you to raise the salary to attract
- 19 other applicants and to post that. So that would be one
- 20 of the questions, and that's what you're asking for.
- 21 The other is that if we were to give you
- 22 that authorization, say today or by tomorrow, then there
- 23 is still need to be that posting that you mentioned, in
- 24 which case we would not be selecting an individual. And
- 25 this is where the email vote suggestion comes in, right?

- 1 Because it needs to be approved by the final Commission.
- 2 So my question is, if we give you that authorization
- 3 even by tomorrow, you will not be able to get a budget
- 4 officer until our next meeting in a couple of weeks
- 5 because of posting requirements. Is that correct?
- 6 MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes, on both counts. I'm
- 7 asking for the increase in salary, but unless there's
- 8 some mechanism that we can put in place in between, we
- 9 are stuck with the fourteen-day noticing period and
- 10 meeting again in full Commission, and after that the
- 11 only other alternative I can think of is if there's some
- 12 way to put somebody in on an interim basis, but I think
- 13 we still run kind of acropper of the initiative.
- 14 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: So Let's say that we
- 15 move forward with that by tomorrow, that you post that,
- 16 you select an individual. Is there a way of doing a
- 17 short-term contract with that individual to begin to
- 18 provide those services in anticipation that we will have
- 19 an affirmative vote on the part of the Commission on the
- 20 individual that you have selected?
- 21 MR. MILLER: I don't know the answer to your
- 22 question for sure. I wish there were an analogue to the
- 23 simplicity that business enjoys in terms of being able
- 24 to nimbly put in place the services that it requires to
- 25 conduct its core business. And very typically the State

- 1 does not have provisions that permit that expeditious
- 2 use of resource.
- And I don't know the exact answer, but my
- 4 inclination is that we would have to work very carefully
- 5 through a State process to see if we could attain, on an
- 6 interim basis, as essentially an independent contractor
- 7 those services, subject to later confirmation in the
- 8 employment status of the individual. I think it's a
- 9 good idea. We will look into that, but I can't say how
- 10 it will come out presently.
- 11 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: I might add that one of
- 12 the reasons that we hired you is because of your
- 13 ni mbl eness.
- 14 MR. MILLER: The spirit of nimbleness.
- 15 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yes, I was thinking
- 16 along similar terms. A couple of meetings ago we
- 17 approved authority under 50, right, for special
- 18 contracts, subcontracts, purchasing. So I would like us
- 19 to explore the possibility of some potential consultant
- 20 contract, and then we could come back for a vote on a
- 21 permanent staff position.
- MR. MILLER: Well, why don't we go ahead and
- 23 do that, provide us that authority subject to our
- 24 confirmation that we can actually use it.
- 25 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I can bear with that.

1	COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Dan, an
2	additional question on this. I'm under the assumption
3	that having some additional budget officer capacity
4	behind you will be the only way we're able to have a
5	draft finance narrative or needs statement between now
6	and our Sacramento meeting; is that correct?
7	MR. CLAYPOOL: No. It was my original
8	intention for this, my primary intention was to give us
9	that ability to put together this statement of needs
10	that we need to go forward to to the legislature and to
11	the Department of Finance. But we're capable of putting
12	that statement of needs together with the staff we have
13	right now. What we will do with it is we will put it
14	together from the information we gather right now.
15	We'll have the final conclusion, and then that person
16	should be on board by then to oversee what we've done
17	and make the final adjustments to it.
18	If that weren't the case, however, there
19	is the services of a very knowledgeable individual that
20	has worked with the largest contract through Department
21	of General Services that they've ever had, was offered
22	to us out of the senate office, and we would run our
23	statement of needs past that person as an alternative.
24	So we have the means to go to someone who can look at
25	our plan and say, "You need more here; you need more

- 1 there." It would have just been easier to construct
- 2 with this individual.
- 3 And to Commissioner Raya, I just received
- 4 an email from our staff that we have three individuals
- 5 who have been recommended who will be in on Monday to
- 6 interview, and we're trying to contact that fourth
- 7 person. So clearly once the prospect that we might be
- 8 able to elevate the salary range was put in play, it
- 9 gave us a wider pool.
- 10 COMMISSIONER YAO: In light of the tight
- 11 schedule that we're facing and in light of the fact that
- 12 lack of a budget officer is impacting our ability to put
- 13 together the additional funding requests, I think it
- 14 will be wise for us to go ahead and give the director
- 15 the approval to increase the salary range. We can
- 16 always look at all the candidates and make a decision,
- 17 even with the increase in salary, in terms of selecting
- 18 the candidate at a later date. But in light of the fact
- 19 that we have such urgent needs, I think we're perhaps
- 20 penny-wise and pound-foolish in terms of trying to
- 21 manage the budget in that manner at this level.
- So let me try to float a motion saying
- 23 that approve the executive director's wish to increase
- 24 the salary range and post it immediately and solicit all
- 25 the potential candidates and go on from there, as

- 1 compared to trying to micromanage it from the Commission
- 2 at this point in time.
- 3 COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner, yeah, I think
- 4 we're just waiting for the range that Dan said he would
- 5 get later today?
- 6 MR. CLAYPOOL: Correct.
- 7 COMMISSIONER YAO: I would say approve it and
- 8 trust the executive director with posting the range as
- 9 compared to having to look at the number ourselves and
- 10 decide as to whether that's good or bad. It just takes
- 11 time and eat into our schedule that we really can't
- 12 afford to lose. That's all.
- 13 COMMISSIONER DAI: I personally think we can
- 14 wait until he has a number. I mean I don't think it's
- 15 going to take anymore time.
- 16 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yeah, I would second
- 17 that motion.
- 18 CHAIRMAN WARD: Second Commission Yao's or
- 19 Commissioner Dai's?
- 20 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: To Mr. Yao's.
- 21 COMMISSIONER WARD: So we have a motion on the
- 22 floor, then.
- Commissioner Blanco, did you have an
- 24 alternative motion that you were considering?
- 25 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: No.

1 CHAIRMAN WARD: Okay. 2 Kirk, did you ask us to consider -- you asked us to consider giving you additional authority for 3 4 contracting, correct? 5 MR. MILLER: Well, I believe that you 6 indicated that, with respect to hiring someone on an 7 interim basis, that that authority is already there from 8 a prior meeting, and we'll look into using it. This is 9 a different motion on the salary range. 10 CHAIRMAN WARD: Okay, let's open the motion to 11 give the executive director approval to increase the 12 salary range for the position of budget and finance 13 director to the public. 14 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I'd like to wait to see 15 the figures. 16 AUDI ENCE MEMBER: Good day again, 17 Commissioners. I was thinking of applying to be a 18 commissioner and the pay looked reasonable for that. 19 And I don't think, with all the unemployed folks these 20 days, I'm sure if it stays the same salary and gets out 21 enough that a competent person would come forward, and I 22 don't think we should cave to a greedy prospective 23 candi date. Thank you. 24 CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you. 25 Just for the panel, we have a motion on

- 1 the floor that was seconded, so we need to address that
- 2 issue at this time. So having no further public
- 3 comment, we'll go ahead and put this issue to vote
- 4 unless there's more panel discussion.
- 5 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'm just
- 6 clarifying. I'm not clear why we would need to take the
- 7 vote now if we anticipate that Dan will have some budget
- 8 numbers for us while we're still in session. I
- 9 personally, at least, even if you had a range, would
- 10 feel more comfortable taking this vote. And if you
- 11 think you'll have some hard numbers for us while we're
- 12 in session, I'd suggest we wait.
- 13 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I would move to table
- 14 this motion until those numbers are presented to the
- 15 Commission.
- 16 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Second.
- 17 CHAIRMAN WARD: So we have an alternative
- 18 motion on the floor to table the original motion until
- 19 salary figures are available, and that has been
- 20 seconded.
- 21 Is there additional public comment on the
- 22 amended motion to refer the vote to give the executive
- 23 director permission to increase the salary for the
- 24 budget and finance director to a later time when the
- 25 increase numbers are available?

1	And seeing no one approaching the mike
2	COMMISSIONER ONTAL: Just to make sure, those
3	figures are going to come in when? Today?
4	MR. CLAYPOOL: I've already sent a message
5	last night and then referring that we need them as soon
6	as possible, so I would anticipate that we would have
7	that salary range, or that estimate that DGS gives us
8	sometime today.
9	COMMISSIONER YAO: I would support the
10	alternate motion, so I think we need to vote on the
11	alternate motion first.
12	COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Sorry. Just as a
13	matter of parliamentary procedure, motion to table is a
14	separate motion; it's not an amendment to your motion.
15	It's just to table it until later.
16	CHAIRMAN WARD: Okay. All in favor of coming
17	back and visiting the issue of raising the budget and
18	finance director's salary range to a higher level once
19	those numbers are available, please raise your hand and
20	say "yes."
21	COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
22	CHAIRMAN WARD: All opposed?
23	Any abstain?
24	All right. We'll revisit that.
25	Mr. Claypool, you mentioned that the
	Susan M. Pattorson, CSP

- 1 Google calendar, shared calendar had been put into
- 2 motion and was available online, and I believe Christina
- 3 took care of that for us. My understanding was, from
- 4 some feedback, that there's been multiple issues with
- 5 that, or it's not exactly ready for use. Is that
- 6 correct?
- 7 MR. CLAYPOOL: I believe that I should
- 8 actually have been in contact with Commissioner Dai and
- 9 so forth. And the issue is kind of the overlaying
- 10 clutter that will end up occurring if we use our main
- 11 calendar for all things.
- 12 What Christina has suggested and I think
- is probably a pretty good idea is to have several
- 14 calendars. One of them would be for scheduling up our
- 15 meetings down the way, and you could each put whether
- 16 you would be there or which ones you could be available
- 17 for, and then have another calendar that would be
- 18 availability. It just will be more manageable than one
- 19 calendar. I can only imagine what your calendars look
- 20 like right now, and if we overlay fourteen of them I
- 21 think it will just become too cumbersome.
- So that's the issue we're dealing with.
- 23 Christina is putting together a plan, and she was hoping
- 24 to send that out in an email of instructions to you
- 25 saying this is how we propose to do it. And then we

- 1 need your input as to whether or not it works for you or
- 2 if it's cumbersome or what changes you would recommend
- 3 in it.
- 4 CHAIRMAN WARD: Okay, thank you. Yeah, I'd
- 5 understood that there were technical issues with that
- 6 calendar that made it possibly not a viable option at
- 7 this time. I guess my information was incorrect, then,
- 8 correct?
- 9 MR. CLAYPOOL: I think originally when we
- 10 spoke, because this was a last-night thing that I got
- 11 back to with Christina, so I think that she had worked
- 12 over some of the technical issues, particularly with
- 13 Commissioner Dai, and this morning the response to me
- 14 was this would be a better approach to it. So I think
- 15 she's got a route around the issue and we've resolved
- 16 those technical issues.
- 17 CHAIRMAN WARD: Excellent. Thank you so much.
- 18 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Dan, can I ask
- 19 an additional question. I think our most urgent order
- 20 of business for this session is actually putting into
- 21 place our schedule for March, so is there the
- 22 possibility we could get it up and running to at least
- 23 test its capacity for scheduling our March sessions?
- 24 MR. CLAYPOOL: I believe it's up and running
- 25 right now for March. I mean I think we've got a

- 1 calendar that will allow you to put in your availability
- 2 for March. All we're talking about now is whether
- 3 you're going to go on there and find two calendars, one
- 4 that would be for scheduling your availability and then
- 5 the next calendar would be for signing up for different
- 6 venues as we set them in place. But we will get an
- 7 email out to all of you from Christina on that today.
- 8 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you.
- 9 COMMISSIONER YAO: Can I address the public
- 10 comment, the paper replacement with just the email. Can
- 11 we find a way to number these public comments so that we
- 12 don't basically have to track it by date, so that if
- 13 we're finished with public comment number 352 we know
- 14 where to pick up from that point?
- MR. CLAYPOOL: I don't see any reason why we
- 16 couldn't number it. If we can put a date on each one of
- 17 them we ought to be able to put a number. I would
- 18 suggest that we could probably do both. It would be
- 19 helpful to not only date it but number it, so we'll make
- 20 a note of that.
- 21 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I have a few
- 22 questions on that as well, Dan. I was relying on paper
- 23 copies and assumed that we would get the paper copies
- 24 for this meeting. In looking at the public comments on
- 25 the website, which I was not reviewing the public

- 1 comments on the website so I was counting on the paper
- 2 copies. And I certainly appreciate that, and I don't
- 3 want paper copies. I certainly appreciate your
- 4 recommendation. But I do have a few questions.
- 5 When did staff stop giving us paper
- 6 copies so that I can make a determination of the dates
- 7 of the information that I have not had an opportunity to
- 8 review based on what's on the website, number one. And,
- 9 number two, how quickly do the public comments get on
- 10 the web if they are sent in by mail or email, or how
- 11 quickly do they get on the website?
- 12 MR. CLAYPOOL: In response to your first
- 13 question, then the package that you would have received
- 14 would have been similar to the last session, and it
- 15 would have been all the public comments since the last
- 16 session. And that would have been available to you, if
- 17 we had done it by the paper method, at the start of this
- 18 sessi on.
- Now, having said that, in the past I
- 20 believe there was a reliance that we weren't sending
- 21 them to you as we received them, that you were only
- 22 going to get them at the start of the session anyway and
- 23 that you would have been picking them up if you had gone
- 24 to the website at that time. There again, we have this
- 25 communications issue where we need to make sure that

- 1 we're on the same page. But you are missing, if you
- 2 haven't checked the website, from the last session.
- 3 But, as I understand it, that's not a large volume, or
- 4 the volume's actually picked up since we entered session
- 5 here.
- To answer your second question, it's --
- 7 I'm trying to think of the best way to put this. The
- 8 easiest way for us to manage this is by having you go to
- 9 that website and check them, and as we pick up more
- 10 volume that's just going to be -- it would be very
- 11 problematic to provide it by paper.
- 12 Did I answer both questions?
- 13 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Yes. A few
- 14 follow-ups in that regard.
- MR. CLAYPOOL: Go ahead.
- 16 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Is it still SOS
- 17 that's managing the website and putting these comments
- on here, or do we have a staff member that's doing that?
- 19 MR. CLAYPOOL: It's still SOS. And the whole
- 20 issue -- and that was the second question I needed to
- 21 address. The whole issue with the Secretary of State --
- 22 and they're desperate to get us our own authority
- 23 because they have an election coming and we're eating up
- 24 valuable staff time of the one person they have who
- 25 manages their website. But because of the procurement

- 1 issue -- and this is why we're going around though
- 2 university services trying to find someone. The biggest
- 3 issue isn't the \$100, because we can fund that. We can
- 4 find money for the things that keep our office running.
- 5 The biggest issue is that you cannot enter into any IT
- 6 contract at all until the Department of General Services
- 7 gives you permission. And our biggest need right now is
- 8 a web designer and web maintenance and desktop services.
- 9 So until that occurs we're just married to the Secretary
- 10 of State's office, and so they're working, on our behalf
- 11 as well as the Department of Finance and General
- 12 Services, to resolve that issue.
- 13 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: So would your
- 14 recommendation be that we just withhold any suggestions
- on changing? For instance, it appears that the public
- 16 comments are in alphabetical order, which then makes it
- 17 difficult, so then I have to look at each of the dates
- 18 because one of the most recent, February 2nd, is from
- 19 Wright, and it's "W" way down at the bottom. So should
- 20 I just withhold any recommendations about how this
- 21 should be structured on the web to make it easier for
- 22 obviously members of the public that are keeping track
- of the public comments, as well as the Commission
- 24 members?
- MR. CLAYPOOL: No, I think your recommendation

- 1 should be made and we should move to -- I don't know
- 2 that it will be any problem for this person to simply
- 3 reorder them by date and attach a number to them, if
- 4 that's the way we want to see them, rather than by
- 5 alphabetical order. And it makes more sense, in my
- 6 mind, to have it by chronological order. In that case
- 7 what would happen is they would make that change at the
- 8 Secretary of State's office and we would simply inherit
- 9 your recommendation when it was transferred to us.
- 10 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Then I would ask
- 11 that you convey that to the Secretary of State, that we
- 12 would like to see the public comments in chronological
- order so that we may be able to keep track more
- 14 appropriately. And then, as Commissioner Yao has
- 15 suggested, I guess by number. I won't be following the
- 16 number; I'll be following the date. But I appreciate
- 17 that. Thank you.
- 18 CHAIRMAN WARD: Along that line, Dan, can we
- 19 talk about our Secretary of State's relationship
- 20 presently and any transition issues that you're managing
- 21 at this time? What presently is the Secretary of State
- 22 performing for us?
- 23 MR. CLAYPOOL: Well, the Secretary of State
- 24 still maintains our website, clearly. They maintain all
- of our desktop support. And when we need -- when we

- 1 need almost anything they step in and assist us. I've
- 2 said it over and over again, but Dora Mejia, Chris Maio
- 3 in charge of our IT system, those people just step up
- 4 continually. And so they've gone above and beyond in
- 5 every request we've made.
- The biggest issues are resolving really
- 7 the large bureaucratic issues that we have. The
- 8 Department of General Services is the case that I've
- 9 been harping on the most because of delegated authority.
- 10 We still have an issue with the State controller's
- office in answering the codes, and that was just sent
- 12 over to me right now, just entering the basic codes so
- 13 that staff can be recognized on the State's payroll
- 14 system as being people that need to be paid. So Dora
- 15 Mejia as the fiscal officer for the Secretary of State,
- 16 as well as Raul Villanueva, have been working just
- 17 tirelessly with them to ask them, "What else do you
- 18 need?"
- 19 These are things that the entities
- 20 involved are aware of. They are very bureaucratic in
- 21 nature. As Kirk mentioned, there is a lack of
- 22 nimbleness to the State system that then requires that
- 23 certain boxes be checked, and that's what we're moving
- 24 through. Will staff be paid? Yes. That's going to
- 25 occur.

- But those are really the only issues.

 When we resolve the delegated authority, then we find
- 3 somebody for the website. But really when we resolve
- 4 the delegated authority we can put the IT services in
- 5 place and then we can cast off and away from the
- 6 Secretary of State's office, and it will be a happy
- 7 moment for both sides.
- 8 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Blanco?
- 9 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I just wanted to point
- 10 out that the list of commissioners that's on the home
- 11 page needs to be updated. It still has Commissioner Kuo
- 12 and doesn't include Mr. Ancheta.
- MR. CLAYPOOL: We'll send it back and that
- 14 will be updated.
- 15 CHAIRMAN WARD: You mentioned in your
- 16 executive director report status on the Blackberry cell
- 17 phones that are being issued. I'm just wondering, for
- 18 public reference, if Kirk might be able to give us just
- 19 a real quick explanation as to -- many of the
- 20 commissioners actually desired not to have a second
- 21 phone to have to carry around or worry about, but
- there's some discovery issues that are involved in that
- 23 which makes it extremely necessary to have that. And
- 24 I'm just wondering for public sake if you can give us a
- 25 few quick comments as to what that's about.

- 1 MR. MILLER: I think this issue comes under
- 2 the heading of the Public Records Act, which is one
- 3 that's gotten a little bit less attention, as best I can
- 4 tell, than the Public Meetings Act. We ought to come
- 5 back and talk about it.
- 6 But the short answer to your question is
- 7 that email communications that reside on a mobile device
- 8 are almost -- it is likely that those communications
- 9 would be covered by the Public Records Act, which means
- 10 that if we get a request for them commissioners would
- 11 have to provide those, which has two implications. One
- 12 is, people should be thoughtful about how things are
- 13 expressed in that forum, and the other is the burden of
- 14 producing those. And while it can certainly be done
- 15 from a personal mobile device other than the
- 16 State-provided one, it would just make that easier if
- 17 they're all in one place.
- 18 COMMISSIONER DAI: I just wanted to clarify
- 19 for the Commission and for the public -- I'm hesitant.
- 20 I see I'm evolving into the role of the technology
- 21 person here. But since we're using Google apps, our
- 22 emails are in the Cloud so they are not resident on our
- 23 device, so that's not something that we should have to
- 24 worry about.
- 25 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Being the person, the

- 1 least technological person here, I know we had a
- 2 conversation about being able to put multiple emails on
- 3 your cell phone. For some of us that's very
- 4 challenging, so even though it may be in the Cloud, I
- 5 still have to access it, and that was my concern, part
- 6 of my concern about having a separate device so I could
- 7 just say okay, there's this. I don't have to figure out
- 8 how to do it on my phone.
- 9 COMMISSIONER DAI: If it's easier for you to
- 10 carry a second device rather than figuring out how to
- 11 configure a phone, I would say go for it. But it's
- 12 relatively easy to configure it and I'm happy to help
- 13 you.
- 14 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I'm just not sure it's
- 15 just in the Cloud, Commissioner. I mean I have it
- 16 installed. The Google Chrome is on my blackberry. And
- 17 it's on my Blackberry; it's just not just on the Cloud.
- 18 If somebody goes into my Commission email that's on my
- 19 Blackberry, it's there.
- 20 COMMISSIONER DAI: That's true, but you could
- 21 delete that at any time and it would still be in the
- 22 Cloud so you wouldn't be getting rid of the actual
- email.
- 24 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Right. But I think we
- should be careful about deleting things.

1	COMMISSIONER DAI: But because it's in the
2	Cloud you're not actually deleting it. It's just not on
3	your device anymore. You're no longer accessing it.
4	CHAIRMAN WARD: Perhaps we should direct staff
5	to go ahead and clear up the issue. Again, I know that
6	I was looked into this when that issue came up and
7	was absolutely directed that if any text messaging
8	between commissioners, anything like that occurred, that
9	your personal cell phone would then become public record
10	and discoverable and things like that. I was assured
11	that's true. Maybe it's not. I don't know. But let's
12	just direct staff at this point to further clarify that
13	and get back to the Commission.
14	COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: If I may just
15	have one clarification, just for the ease of staff and
16	so that there isn't multiple work that's done, this was
17	an issue that was discussed in the legal subcommittee
18	regarding Public Records Act, and we were considering
19	training for the Commission on Public Records Act. Is
20	it possible that the individual that we select that
21	would present training, whether it's Mr. Miller or
22	whether he designates somebody else for training, that
23	could probably look into it in more detail rather than
24	just because it is a legal Public Records Act issue
25	and a technology issue. No reason to burden the staff

- 1 and have our potential training consultant advise us on
- 2 that.
- 3 MR. MILLER: I believe we talked about
- 4 revisiting the Public Meetings law, and I think it would
- 5 make sense if we could just double-down and also discuss
- 6 this issue at the same time. That would make sense.
- 7 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And add a
- 8 technical component. Okay, thank you.
- 9 I have one other question for Dan. Dan,
- 10 you had said that these Blackberries and whatever
- 11 contracts were being worked out with the SOS, you were
- 12 then going to consider the most feasible way for
- 13 delivery. I'll just let you know that I don't mind
- 14 waiting and picking it up personally in Sacramento.
- 15 There's no reason to mail it to me, if it's available by
- our next meeting on the 23rd, so you don't have to worry
- 17 about delivery to me. No reason to incur the cost for
- 18 it.
- 19 CHAIRMAN WARD: We'll put together a list,
- 20 then, and get that to Dan before we leave.
- 21 MR. CLAYPOOL: We're all for avoiding costs,
- 22 so if that's fine with everyone, absolutely.
- 23 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes, it is.
- 24 CHAIRMAN WARD: Mr. Claypool, you'd asked for
- 25 some direction on how to better communicate between

- 1 sessions, is that correct, in the executive director
- 2 report? Is that one of the things you'd asked for?
- 3 MR. CLAYPOOL: Actually I had said that, and
- 4 it came out of a conversation yesterday that there was a
- 5 communication gap on our agenda that we had. And so I
- 6 believe that the Vice Chair is working on some possible
- 7 comments, and so we will look forward to those. But I
- 8 think that they were going to be an item under
- 9 governance, but I will defer to the Vice Chair.
- 10 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: We have a
- 11 series of items under governance, so I'm not sure. Are
- 12 we still tackling governance tomorrow?
- 13 CHAIRMAN WARD: Since it was raised in the
- 14 executive director report, I don't necessarily have an
- objection to getting it done now. Let's hammer it out.
- 16 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay.
- 17 CHAIRMAN WARD: I think one of the things that
- 18 was identified was talking about a 24-hour limit by
- 19 which to acknowledge a receipt of correspondence. So
- 20 that would look like, if a commissioner or staff member
- 21 were to receive an email from the staff or another
- 22 commissioner, that within 24 hours there would be an
- 23 expectation that you reply in kind, even if that means
- 24 nothing more than, "I received your email and we'll
- address it by Friday," or something like that.

- 1 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Mr. Chairman, excuse me.
- 2 Before we get into this discussion may we have a brief
- 3 break?
- 4 CHAIRMAN WARD: My Vice asked for that and I
- 5 ignored it. Absolutely. Let's do that. We'll break
- 6 for -- let's do a ten-minute break and we'll convene
- 7 back at 40 after the hour.
- 8 (Recess from 10: 29 a.m. to 10: 44
- 9 a.m.)
- 10 CHAIRMAN WARD: With the Commission seated and
- 11 a quorum present, we'll continue on with the meeting.
- 12 Thanks to the thoroughness of the executive director's
- 13 report, we've almost knocked out governance issues
- 14 completely, so this is fantastic. We're getting two for
- one here this morning.
- And I'd like to turn it over to the Vice
- 17 Chair who, as I understand, had considered some of these
- 18 feedback items for the executive director's request, and
- 19 she'll bring us up to speed.
- 20 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you,
- 21 Commissioner Ward. You began to introduce one of the
- 22 items that I'd like to come to some agreement on as a
- 23 Commission, and that was regarding a baseline protocol
- 24 for turnaround time between commissioner and staff
- 25 communications and requests. So the goal here is not to

- 1 say staff hasn't been doing their job and hasn't been
- 2 responsive. It's we want you to have a sense of how
- 3 quickly you can expect for us to respond to your request
- 4 and vice versa. And so the suggestion was made as a
- 5 24-hour turnaround time and that we institute that email
- 6 communication is the main mode of communication. Of
- 7 course there will be exceptions to that, but in terms of
- 8 allowing us a system to be able to track and staff,
- 9 giving them I think a little more flexibility on how to
- 10 manage the influx of communication. So my suggestion,
- 11 for conversation purposes, would be does 24 hours seem
- 12 reasonable as a mutual expectation between commissioners
- 13 and staff?
- 14 Commi ssi oner Yao?
- 15 COMMISSIONER YAO: Unless it's advantageous to
- 16 do so, don't just respond to all. Most of the time just
- 17 respond directly to the executive director. But if
- 18 there's information you feel it's advantageous to share
- 19 with all the other commissioners then do it in response
- 20 to all.
- 21 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: One
- 22 clarification point, too. This doesn't mean we expect
- 23 that staff will have the answers to all of our questions
- 24 within 24 hours, but that you will acknowledge receipt
- and next steps.

1	MR. CLAYPOOL: Absolutely. And we were
2	actually hoping that we were responding much more
3	quickly than that, and in most cases that's what we try
4	to do. I would ask everyone when we're looking at
5	gmail because this has been the biggest problem we've
6	had is to expand every time you get a response,
7	expand that entire email list so that you see whether or
8	not there's a response in there somewhere. And I know
9	that gmail shows you what's been opened and hasn't, but
10	it has been for me on several occasions I've missed a
11	comment from someone because it's in the middle of a
12	17-string email. And so the other thing I would ask is
13	that if you have something that's very urgent that we
14	need to address right now, make it a new message and
15	that way the expansion issue doesn't become an issue.
16	Thank you.
17	COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Great.
18	So seeing no concerns, disagreement, 24
19	hours is our protocol for commissioner-staff
20	communication and requests, and we will be relying on
21	email as the primary mode of communication.
22	The second governance point that I wanted
23	to bring up to the Commission for full discussion is in
24	regards to our Chair and Vice Chair responsibilities and
25	protocol for developing agendas for our meetings. Of

- 1 course our intent in establishing a rotating chair/Vice
- 2 Chair structure was that we would not only be a
- 3 well-oiled machine but that we would be a multi-partisan
- 4 machine, that we would be a collaborative machine.
- 5 I think that as we've been testing out
- 6 the system a few issues have come to light that we could
- 7 easily address, and that is really regarding chain of
- 8 command and division of responsibilities and timeline on
- 9 how to get a comprehensive supplemental agenda out to
- 10 folks in advance of the meetings. Now, we of course
- 11 have been posting our broad agenda with our fourteen-day
- 12 meeting notice, but what we've been attempting to do is
- 13 to create a supplemental agenda, or an expansion, in
- 14 effect, where we're able to put much more detail, even
- 15 some timing as to the order of business that will be
- 16 taking place in any given meeting. I think the tricky
- 17 part has been when multiple commissioners have
- 18 suggestions for those agendas, where do those
- 19 suggestions go, by when do they need to come in order
- 20 for us to really be able to turn around an agenda in a
- 21 way that makes sense.
- 22 Having just recently been through this
- 23 process as Vice Chair and Commissioner Ward as Chair, we
- 24 wanted to put out a suggested timeline, which I did
- 25 speak with Mr. Claypool regarding to see if this would

- 1 work. The suggestion is that we have a 72-hour
- 2 previous-to-our-meeting-time deadline for all
- 3 commissioners to get in their suggested agenda items.
- 4 The agenda items as suggested would go to the Chair for
- 5 that meeting. Then the Chair, by 48 hours prior to the
- 6 meeting, locks in the agenda. That is the agenda that
- 7 staffs works with. That's the agenda that gets posted,
- 8 the detailed agenda, recognizing that later down the
- 9 road as our work picks up we may need to compress this
- 10 and say that it's a 48-hour deadline and a 24-hour
- 11 deadline. But for now it seems like 72 and 48 could
- 12 work.
- 13 Let me just run down what that would look
- 14 like for Sacramento, which is the meeting that I would
- 15 be chairing. So we're scheduled to start meeting on
- 16 Wednesday morning I believe at 9:00 o'clock with our
- 17 subcommittee meetings. So Sunday morning at 9:00
- 18 o'clock would be the deadline for which commissioners
- 19 would send any suggested agenda items to myself. I
- 20 would then, over the next 24 hours, work with
- 21 Commissioner Filkins Webber, or we probably would have
- 22 been in some communication before that regarding the
- 23 agenda. And so 48 hours prior to the meeting, which
- 24 would be Monday morning, you could expect that you would
- 25 have an agenda to review, and that would also give a

- 1 couple days worth of time where you would have the
- 2 opportunity to prep before the meeting, which is really
- 3 our intention as well.
- 4 That's my thought around that, and just
- 5 wanted to put it out to the full Commission for
- 6 discussion. Hopefully we can come out with some
- 7 protocol.
- 8 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Question. This also
- 9 includes the subcommittee agendas?
- 10 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes, because it
- 11 would be for the full agenda.
- 12 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: For the full agenda. So
- 13 also the details of the subcommittee would have the same
- 14 notice.
- 15 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Um-hmm.
- 16 Um-hmm.
- 17 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Okay.
- 18 COMMISSIONER YAO: While we're discussing the
- 19 agenda I'd like also to throw up this concept of any
- 20 agenda item that involves a lot of public participation.
- 21 We should try to define the timeline for that and not
- 22 allow the previous agenda overrunning and delaying that
- 23 particular item. Because a lot of public come into the
- 24 meeting with the intent of addressing us on that
- 25 particular item, and often when we overrun our schedule

- 1 we basically cause them to either miss it entirely
- 2 because they can't allocate a sufficient time to wait
- 3 for us to finish, but doing so probably would force us
- 4 to table whatever unfinished business we have from the
- 5 previous item until a later time. So I don't know
- 6 whether you want to have a little bit of discussion as
- 7 to whether we want to perhaps implement something like
- 8 that in the interest of allowing the public to address
- 9 us in a more timely manner.
- 10 COMMISSIONER DAI: I just want to say I think
- 11 that's an excellent suggestion, and so I think, you
- 12 know, we would indicate if you're submitting an item for
- an agenda and you think there's going to be, you know,
- 14 substantial public comment on it to note, but otherwise
- 15 that I would expect the Chair and the Vice Chair to
- 16 define a period for public comment and so that that can
- 17 be noted on the agenda and maybe kind of called out for
- 18 the public.
- 19 MR. MILLER: I thought it might be helpful,
- 20 just one note of clarification. Please keep in mind,
- 21 when thinking about agenda items, in our fourteen-day
- 22 notice we have to give the public reasonable guidance
- 23 about the topics that will be discussed. We can
- 24 fine-tune how those slot in under that agenda, but it's
- 25 not possible a few days before a meeting to add a whole

- 1 new agenda item that's not already covered in the public
- 2 notice.
- 3 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Definitely. I
- 4 had requested for staff to have copies of the Sacramento
- 5 agenda. Do we have those available now or we'll get
- 6 them later in the day?
- 7 MR. CLAYPOOL: I'm fairly certain that Janeece
- 8 had actually printed those, but she's out right now
- 9 printing a different item. It may be right here.
- 10 COMMISSIONER YAO: It's been posted on the
- 11 website already.
- 12 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: It's already
- been posted on the web.
- So that would be for Sacramento, for
- 15 example. Then that agenda already provides the
- 16 parameters for what types of expansions you can add into
- 17 the agenda. It would not go outside of what's already
- 18 been noticed, but it would provide a greater level of
- 19 detail.
- 20 CHAIRMAN WARD: I'd just like to submit that,
- 21 as commissioners, we all own the process of setting the
- 22 agenda and things like that, and it really is the Chair
- 23 and Vice Chair's job, along with staff, to set that
- 24 agenda and put it together. And so any comments, I
- 25 would say get to them and they'll figure out whether or

- 1 not it fits and where to fit it and everything else.
- 2 But bring the feedback. Let's just observe, unless
- 3 there's guides otherwise, the recommended timeframes so
- 4 that everybody can do their job.
- 5 And I think another thing along the lines
- 6 of that is, if -- beyond just agenda items to the Chair
- 7 and Vice Chair or to staff, I think that if there's
- 8 guest speakers or someone that comes up to you and wants
- 9 to address the Commission, things like that, it would
- 10 be -- rather than just inviting them to come and do it,
- 11 if it's someone you know, someone you work with,
- 12 something like that, and they have an area of expertise
- 13 that they wish to share, perhaps we should forward that
- 14 to the staff or Chair or Vice Chair for consideration of
- 15 allocating time or something like that.
- We've run into times, as we all know, in
- 17 the past where people with said expertise are invited to
- 18 come and address the Commission at open session, and so
- 19 they come prepared with a 15-minute presentation, which
- 20 really isn't fair to the public, for others that have
- 21 come to give comment in just a small amount of time, to
- 22 have that time eaten up by one person as opposed to
- 23 giving equal time to everybody. It seems like it could
- 24 get us into trouble down the road. That's just a
- 25 suggestion I have from my end.

- 1 Mr. Claypool, did you have a comment on 2 that?
- 3 MR. CLAYPOOL: Not actually a comment on that
- 4 because all of these are great suggestions. But I just
- 5 wanted to step back to the original idea that
- 6 Commissioner Galambos Malloy had propositioned as far as
- 7 the 48-hour and then the 24-hour period between there
- 8 where we solidified the final items between the Vice
- 9 Chair and the Chair. I would hope that we would
- 10 actually have that 24-hour period. I think what we
- originally discussed was having that be the time that
- 12 staffed needed to ensure that it was run by the chief
- 13 counsel, and then we had time to get it up on our
- 14 website.
- Now, the only reason we needed a 24-hour
- 16 period -- so we're talking about three days, 72 hours.
- 17 The only reason we need a 24-hour period for that is
- 18 because we're working through the Secretary of State's
- 19 office. And if we get the changes at 7:00 o'clock at
- 20 night, the very earliest we will see anybody is 12:00
- 21 o'clock the next day, and then I don't know how long it
- 22 will take them to post it up. Once we have control of
- 23 our own website we can certainly shorten that time
- 24 period to be, say, twelve hours or whatever it is, but
- 25 we have to be aware that the staff to do this will have

- 1 to be available, and so we need the 48 hours as a final
- 2 deadline and then some period of time, currently I would
- 3 suggest 24 hours, to make sure that we can get it up.
- 4 So we're really talking at this point about a three-day.
- 5 No other changes beyond that unless they're absolutely
- 6 essential. And if that were the case then we would be
- 7 going out to all the commissioners on a different basis
- 8 anyway.
- 9 CHAIRMAN WARD: Any comment on this matter
- 10 before we leave it? Excellent. Very good. All right.
- 11 We're looking forward here to our very
- 12 first subcommittee report to the full Commission, and I
- 13 think when we drew straws the legal is up first.
- 14 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Sorry, just give
- 15 me a moment. Thank you, chair.
- 16 In the legal subcommittee we had an
- 17 opportunity to prioritize various issues, approximately
- 18 eight, and, given the limited amount of time, we did not
- 19 have an opportunity to address all of them. Therefore,
- 20 we prioritized. First we discussed VRA counsel and the
- 21 issues surrounding the necessity to identify an
- 22 individual. And, just in summary, we charged Kirk
- 23 Miller to solicit presentation materials from a number
- 24 of specifically named attorneys. The names of those
- 25 attorneys will be provided by Maria Blanco and I believe

- 1 Commissioner Ancheta, just as a starting point. We've
- 2 also asked Mr. Miller to contact the Department of
- 3 Justice as we discussed the possibility that there may
- 4 be individuals in the Department of Justice that might
- 5 very well be interested in this position as our VRA
- 6 counsel.
- We've also discussed and asked Mr. Miller
- 8 to draft the proposed notice that would be placed on the
- 9 website for this position, and I believe
- 10 Commissioner Blanco will also provide Mr. Miller
- 11 locations for other places where announcements can be
- 12 posted for this position.
- We have also considered the possibility
- 14 of coming together again around March 4th in a legal
- 15 subcommittee special meeting, subject to change and
- 16 subject to further detail, but so that we can determine
- 17 the status of the identity of potential individuals.
- 18 And the reason that we did this is because apparently,
- 19 from the experience that we have in the legal
- 20 subcommittee from Commissioner Ancheta's participation
- 21 and Commissioner Blanco, the limited number of people
- 22 that might be qualified for this position, and we
- 23 discussed the possibility of really opening this up
- 24 nationwide. Because it's not a California issue; it's a
- 25 federal law issue. So we certainly would not be bound

- 1 by a particular California attorney, potentially, in
- 2 that regard.
- 3 Once we -- we also discussed the
- 4 possibilities of retainers versus hourly. That went
- 5 around for a while, but what we've agreed on is, more
- 6 than likely, the individual that would be considered for
- 7 this position will present their ideas, and so we might
- 8 very well get various options for how the attorney could
- 9 present their consultation services to this Commission
- 10 and whether it would be a staff position, retainer
- 11 position, or it might very well be that they have an
- 12 entirely different idea that we haven't considered. So
- 13 we haven't narrowed that idea yet. We'll take a look at
- 14 what presentation we can get from the legal
- 15 subcommittee. So we are moving forward on that. We're
- 16 moving forward quickly, and so more than likely we
- 17 should have some information by our special session
- 18 tentatively set for March 4th.
- The next item that we discussed was
- 20 Bagley-Keene training and Public Records Act training.
- 21 We discussed the necessity that at this point, given our
- 22 structure and structure of governance that we've
- 23 elected, in particular subcommittees, that the prior
- 24 training that we received, the first day in particular
- 25 from the BSA -- and in fact I believe Ms. Neville from

- 1 the Bureau of State Audits also provided the training
- 2 for the six in January -- that was a general overall
- 3 training for Bagley-Keene issues. And so we are
- 4 considering one further session of training for the full
- 5 Commission for the sole purpose of having it tailored in
- 6 its presentation of Bagley-Keene for our present
- 7 structure involving the subcommittees or involving some
- 8 IT issues.
- 9 And I didn't note here, but I think we've
- 10 agreed as well that we will coordinate the Public
- 11 Records Act training so, if possible, we either have
- 12 multiple individuals. But Mr. Miller will be looking
- 13 into that and identifying an individual to come and give
- 14 us training. And, again, it may seem duplicative of
- 15 what we've had before, but we're not intending to do
- 16 that. We really want to tailor it to our structure and
- 17 tailor it for the issues that we've seen come up time
- 18 and time again. And if it's possible we could consider
- 19 Donna Neville again or maybe somebody else that
- 20 Mr. Miller -- and, if nobody else, maybe Mr. Miller
- 21 himself. So we discussed that.
- We also discussed something of interest
- that this Commission mentioned at the last full meeting,
- 24 which was Section 8253 of the Government Code. And, as
- you will recall, Section 8253 had a provision in there

- 1 prohibiting communications with and receiving
- 2 communication from the public regarding, quote,
- 3 redistricting matters, close quote, and what does that
- 4 mean. So we actually received very interesting public
- 5 comment on this issue and was most appreciative of the
- 6 suggestions that were made by the public.
- 7 For instance, given that we are dealing
- 8 with a law that does not have any judicial
- 9 interpretation, some of the members of the public have
- 10 suggested to narrowly define what, quote unquote,
- 11 redistricting matters means. And maybe if we narrowly
- 12 defined it to simply information of drawing lines on a
- 13 map, it may free up our concerns, anyway, of going to
- 14 events where we are being asked to speak.
- But overall, regarding some of the other
- 16 issues that have come up, we've asked Mr. Miller and he
- 17 has taken it under advisement regarding -- we discussed
- 18 the full issue, essentially, and he understands the
- 19 issue, and he will be reporting back to us for a full
- 20 discussion of the issue and to further advise this
- 21 Commission regarding his recommendations on
- 22 participation such as what you've done in the past.
- 23 Many of you have given welcoming comments
- 24 and then felt obligated to leave some meetings where
- 25 there were redistricting issues presented, and so that

- 1 issue was fully discussed and presented to Mr. Miller,
- 2 and he will get back to the legal subcommittee and we
- 3 will present it to the full Commission as to what his
- 4 recommendations will be regarding your participation in
- 5 meetings, including webinars. I mean there will be so
- 6 many redistricting functions throughout the United
- 7 States, and obviously we will likely get invitations in
- 8 that regard, and we want to clarify that issue, and
- 9 Mr. Miller will assist us and we will get you that
- 10 answer.
- 11 And then the last item we discussed in
- 12 legal subcommittee but we did not have an opportunity to
- 13 flush out entirely and we will take it up in our next
- 14 legal subcommittee is the idea of some standing
- 15 committee rules for essentially governance. Again, we
- 16 discussed the fact that this Commission had previously
- 17 voted on January 13th to limit public comment to five
- 18 minutes. And, again, we did that for the purpose of
- 19 allowing more participation by the public. It's
- 20 certainly not a circumstance where we were limiting the
- 21 public comment. We really want to hear from a variety
- 22 of individuals. So we briefly discussed some of those
- 23 rules and one other factor of some other additions that
- 24 we'll make to the agenda. But we'll probably come back
- 25 to that issue and be able to present more

- 1 recommendations to the full Commission following our
- 2 next legal subcommittee.
- 3 And that's all the legal advisory
- 4 committee has to report, unless my other fellow
- 5 Commission members would like to add anything.
- 6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Just to mention some
- 7 other things that we talked about, in terms of the
- 8 hiring of the Voting Rights attorney, we also discussed
- 9 the possibility of a pool in academia, that there might
- 10 be -- that could be another place where we could look,
- 11 would be among law professors, in particular, who focus
- 12 on the Voting Rights Act. Again, with the knowledge
- 13 that this is a limited community of folks who do this
- 14 and that we have to deal with issues of perceptions of
- 15 partiality and bias, we were trying to think of where
- 16 can we go. So academia in addition to the Department of
- 17 Justi ce.
- 18 And then we discussed a little bit what
- 19 of the functions, why we thought this was such an
- 20 important position to fill quickly even though some of
- 21 the decision-making is -- you know, around drawing maps
- 22 may come a little later. We thought that -- we
- 23 discussed the fact that this person could even train the
- 24 Commission on things that we need to be able to make
- 25 sure we solicit in the public comment, because there are

- 1 elements that have to go into the consideration of the
- 2 record. When you do present we will have to do a
- 3 report, and that report has to explain certain decisions
- 4 we made, and that means that we have to be able to get
- 5 that information when we do our public meetings and that
- 6 that would be the kind of thing that the attorney could
- 7 train us. And that was part of the discussion about why
- 8 we need to start sooner rather than later.
- 9 And that even identifying legal concerns
- 10 about the outreach meetings, how do we handle
- 11 discussions of race, et cetera. So it's just to add
- 12 that we really began the process of trying to define
- 13 what the attorney has to do for us and why we felt it
- 14 was urgent that we move forward as quickly as possible.
- 15 COMMISSIONER FORBES: And along the same
- 16 lines, we also considered that we're really looking at
- 17 two different attorneys, one that would carry us through
- 18 the August 15th date, and then the idea if we have to
- 19 defend any of these maps that's a whole separate issue.
- 20 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I just wanted to
- 21 comment quickly on Commissioner Blanco's recognition of
- 22 the importance of the VRA expert in terms of the
- 23 outreach, too. And we'll talk later on, but the
- 24 technical and outreach commission sees them as playing
- 25 an integral role in everything from developing materials

- 1 to how the meetings are going to be structured. So as
- 2 soon as -- that was one of our points in terms of
- 3 getting them on board as soon as possible, because any
- 4 consultants that we use, whether it be technical or
- 5 project management, are going to need to have the input
- 6 of the VRA expert as soon as possible.
- 7 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: That's really great to
- 8 know.
- 9 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: Jodie, did your
- 10 subcommittee discuss -- and I'm not even sure if this
- 11 applies or not -- the ex post facto rules that might be
- 12 a part of this process? For example, when we start the
- 13 public testimony meetings where we're talking about
- 14 mapping, and if we have nine commissioners or ten
- 15 commissioners there, the other two or one, would they be
- 16 able to participate in the drawing of maps at some
- 17 subsequent date?
- 18 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I do recall your
- 19 suggestion in that regard. And, given the limited
- 20 amount of time, we had bullet points of various issues
- 21 which included that issue, and I'm afraid we did not get
- 22 an opportunity to get to it based on our prior priority
- 23 to consider VRA counsel. So what I can do is add it to
- 24 our agenda for the next occasion.
- 25 So can you clarify. You're talking about

- 1 -- just state your issue again so I can make sure I
- 2 understand it properly.
- 3 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: If we have a formal
- 4 hearing, say, to discuss a trial map in Riverside and
- 5 not all of the commissioners are able to attend, let's
- 6 say ten of them are present and four are absent, when
- 7 the final decision is made in August to draw the final
- 8 map, because the other two or three were not present,
- 9 are they able to participate in making that final
- 10 deci si on.
- 11 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Got it. Thank
- 12 you.
- 13 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I just wanted to flag
- 14 an issue that I raised actually more as a public comment
- 15 yesterday because I wasn't sworn yet. But one issue
- 16 that I wanted to flag for the full Commission and, in
- 17 particular, the technical committee is that in order to
- 18 look at Voting Rights Act compliance in addition to the
- 19 attorney, we're going to need some sort of social
- 20 science expertise that will enable us to look at certain
- 21 kinds of data which actually are rather hard to get.
- 22 It's not census data. It's not PL 94 or ACS data. It's
- 23 data that revolves around political behavior in
- 24 particular areas where there might be majority/minority
- 25 districts. Part of what's going on with Section 2

- 1 compliance is that we're trying to anticipate where we
- 2 might get sued if we don't draw a particular set of
- 3 lines a certain way.
- 4 We're going to have to ultimately deal
- 5 with a rather sparse data set, unfortunately, which is
- 6 looking at minority voting behavior, racially
- 7 polarized vote, so nonminority voting behavior against
- 8 minority candidates, for example. That data is often
- 9 not generated unless you're litigating, so it's a very
- 10 tricky problem for us to figure out, well, are we just
- 11 going to look at the racial numbers or the ethnic
- 12 numbers, or are we going to look at some other data that
- 13 will help us inform whether there's a potential Section
- 14 2 violation. We need to have that capacity at some
- 15 Level.
- 16 I think it's going to be very difficult,
- 17 if not impossible, to actually try to generate that data
- 18 internally. We may have to rely on whatever data is
- 19 presented to us by the public or by particular groups.
- 20 But we need to have at least the expertise to analyze
- 21 what is available at the time. So I would simply add
- 22 that as a capacity that the Commission and/or staff
- 23 needs to develop in addition to the attorney for
- Voting Rights Act compliance.
- 25 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Since this is

- 1 the first occasion in which we have a report from our
- 2 subcommittee, I appreciate Commissioner Ontai's
- 3 suggestion regarding the possibility of issues that
- 4 should be discussed in legal subcommittee. Would the
- 5 Commission agree that at the time that a subcommittee is
- 6 reporting, that this would be an occasion in which other
- 7 Commission members could raise issues that should be
- 8 brought to the subcommittee so that, then, the next
- 9 occasion that we have our meeting or when we need to
- 10 clarify further agenda issues that we can make sure that
- it's properly noticed, and then we are actually
- 12 fulfilling all of your inquiries for the tasks that you
- 13 would then assign to the subcommittee. So if --
- 14 everybody seems to be shaking their head in agreement.
- 15 Does anyone else, other than Commissioner Ontai, have
- 16 some suggestions for legal subcommittee's consideration
- 17 at our next meeting, or next appropriately noticed
- 18 meeting, if it's not already on our agenda?
- 19 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: One of the things that
- 20 I was going to try to raise late this afternoon -- and
- 21 I'm not sure if this falls in your category but let me
- 22 throw it out there -- is, in trying to structure some of
- 23 these outreach meetings -- and the question has been
- 24 raised by commissioners as well, is what boundaries do
- 25 the commissioners have in terms of responding during the

- 1 public input hearing? Are the commissioners allowed to
- 2 be able to interact with the public? We've talked to
- 3 some of the potential consultants, and they want to know
- 4 what their role is in terms of interacting with the
- 5 public. Where will that dynamic take place? And if you
- 6 can look into that legally that would be helpful.
- 7 COMMISSIONER YAO: Just responding to Jodie's
- 8 comment in term of the request of subcommittee's
- 9 consideration, I think we probably should do that
- 10 offline as compared to doing it in this complete
- 11 meeting. I think we should limit this meeting to issues
- 12 that have been discussed by the subcommittee so that we
- 13 can kind of carry on an in-depth discussion. In terms
- 14 of an additional topic to be considered, I think we
- probably can do best by just doing it offline,
- 16 communication either between two -- two individuals so
- 17 that we don't take up too much time in dealing with that
- 18 in the formal session.
- 19 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: The only
- 20 hesitation I would have in that regard is whether or not
- 21 the issue that's presented is appropriate for the
- 22 subcommittee. For instance, if Mr. Miller feels that a
- 23 question that's being presented to legal is something
- that he should take on his own and should not be
- 25 discussed necessarily in an open subcommittee, it's

- 1 something that could be flushed out here rather than
- 2 overly burdening a subcommittee with communications that
- 3 are ongoing elsewhere, or offline, I mean.
- 4 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: I would concur with
- 5 what Commissioner Filkins Webber has commented on.
- 6 I have an issue that I would like to
- 7 present for consideration by the legal committee, and
- 8 that would be the elements of what would -- I guess for
- 9 lack of a better way to express it, legally defensible
- 10 maps. Ongoing we've had discussions and suggestions
- 11 from the public and others that we are going to be
- 12 challenged in court. And I understand that if we
- 13 follow -- if we meet the mandates of Prop 11, that if we
- 14 have a process that's inclusive of the public, if we
- 15 have a process that incorporates and considers input
- 16 from the public, and if we have a process that is -- in
- 17 deciding on the map drawing that is reasonable and
- 18 rational, that we're going to come up with a product
- 19 that reflects the wishes of the California population.
- 20 But even then we stand to be challenged in court.
- So, for me, even though we meet all of
- 22 those requirements, what are other considerations in
- 23 terms of perhaps things that we should consider, as has
- 24 been brought up, and that we should be careful about in
- 25 conducting outreach meetings and comments that we make

- 1 about racial and ethnic groups, all of those things that
- 2 we're going to get training on, hopefully. But still
- 3 the issue is how do we -- how can we anticipate some of
- 4 the arguments that are going to be made against the maps
- 5 as we present them and how can we prepare for that? And
- 6 I think having -- being cognizant of that will help us
- 7 as we carry on this process.
- 8 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Just one comment
- 9 in that regard. And I think you've made my point
- 10 precisely, Commissioner Aguirre. This issue and what
- 11 you raise I think is an example of what specifically
- 12 needs to be addressed by our VRA counsel and may not
- 13 necessarily be appropriate -- it may be in a discussion
- 14 for legal subcommittee, but I think that this might --
- and it might come about that if we know that Commission
- 16 members have issues that may not be appropriately
- 17 addressed or VRA counsel wants to flush it out, at this
- 18 point I don't want to step on VRA counsel's toes. What
- 19 you raise is a significant issue, and I really would not
- 20 want to impose on our counsel. So I am taking it down.
- 21 I just don't know that it's appropriate for legal
- 22 subcommittee to consider this because we would
- 23 definitely need VRA's input.
- And maybe it might be something that the
- 25 attorneys themselves would wish to draft and present as

- 1 a training to the full Commission and not just
- 2 necessarily limit it to subcommittee, because this issue
- 3 is very important for all of our work. But I am taking
- 4 it down, and I'm sure our VRA counsel will be in our
- 5 legal subcommittee so we'll get to it. That's for sure.
- 6 I just don't know that we can agendize this for our next
- 7 legal subcommittee without VRA counsel.
- 8 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: And I would appreciate
- 9 that comment. My intent on a more general level was to
- 10 raise it to the attention of the full Commission as
- 11 something that we need to prepare for.
- 12 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: And I would just like
- 13 to go back to Commissioner Yao's suggestion. And
- 14 understand that sometimes we may have time constraints,
- 15 but I find that this is a very helpful process to not
- only have the subcommittees reporting to us but to also
- 17 get feedback. I think, having been in a position where
- 18 there's just two people working, you can make some
- 19 progress, but you are limited in terms of getting
- 20 direction, and that has to come from the Commission.
- 21 And I've also recognized that these
- 22 subcommittees don't work in isolation, that they
- 23 overlap, and this is a great opportunity for us to hash
- 24 those things out in a more communal way. So, again,
- 25 while respecting the time constraints, I think it's

- 1 helpful for us to have this discussion, the feedback,
- 2 two ways.
- 3 CHAIRMAN WARD: That's an excellent point and
- 4 exactly right as we understood the subcommittee
- 5 structure to allot for. We all go into our individual
- 6 speciality groups and come up with issues that we
- 7 identify. Technical and outreach, as I understood, the
- 8 technical committee sat in on outreach's meeting and the
- 9 outreach committee sat in on the technical subcommittee
- 10 meeting because their issues overlap so closely and
- 11 intermarry. So the point in bringing these reports to
- 12 the main Commission is so that full discussion on each
- 13 of these items is available in a coordinated and limited
- 14 amount of time.
- 15 I had a question regarding your VRA
- 16 ideas, and I'm wondering if at an earlier date we had
- 17 discussed considering two VRA lawyers. Is that
- 18 something that you guys discussed in the subcommittee?
- 19 And, if not, is it something you're willing to discuss?
- 20 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I can start with that.
- 21 I'm not sure that we specifically discussed two
- 22 attorneys. We did discuss how important it would be for
- 23 whoever we hired to withstand scrutiny in terms of bias,
- 24 perceived bias, and we all agreed that that is a big
- 25 concern and also a problematic one. Because this is a

- 1 field where you have well defined plaintiffs' attorneys
- 2 and well defined defense attorneys. It's not a field
- 3 where you have people that go, do both sides. It's
- 4 really kind of -- you know, you represent defendants or
- 5 you represent plaintiffs in Voting Rights cases.
- 6 And we know that's a big challenge, which
- 7 is one of the reasons we started talking about looking
- 8 at universities, at Department of Justice, maybe state
- 9 AGs. And in that conversation we just briefly said we
- 10 might have to have two, but it was -- it wasn't a
- 11 specific discussion. It was more about us recognizing
- 12 the difficulty in finding someone who will be perceived
- 13 as impartial.
- 14 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And one further
- 15 note in that regard, I think it's going to come down to
- 16 the response that we get from potential candidates. So
- 17 if we find somebody, obviously, that might come from the
- 18 Department of Justice who is completely neutral, in our
- 19 assessment, and unbiased, then we don't even need to get
- 20 to the discussion of two. So I think it's really going
- 21 to be dependent upon who responds to our solicitation.
- 22 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Commissioner Ward, I
- 23 wanted to comment on Commissioner Aguirre's point and
- 24 make a suggestion. I think that as much as we want to
- 25 really move quickly on hiring a Voting Rights attorney,

- 1 it may take a while because of the problems we just
- 2 identified. And we might be holding some hearings, and
- 3 we'll definitely be conducting our own business, you
- 4 know, before we do that hire. And maybe we could work
- 5 with Mr. Miller to begin to at least do some -- take a
- 6 look at some of the law, that the legal committee could,
- 7 so that while we're waiting we aren't just navigating
- 8 without any guidance.
- 9 And I don't know how other commissioners
- 10 feel about that, but I would like to hear if
- 11 commissioners would be willing to have the legal
- 12 committee work with our counsel in the meantime to
- 13 figure out if there is something we need, to do some at
- 14 least initial training for the commissioners.
- 15 COMMISSIONER DAI: So I just wanted to respond
- 16 to that. I think that's a great idea, and we obviously
- 17 have your expertise and Commissioner Ancheta's
- 18 expertise, so we should certainly take advantage of that
- 19 in parallel as we are conducting a search.
- 20 CHAIRMAN WARD: Yeah, legal training was an
- 21 agendized item for all subcommittees, so identifying
- 22 areas of training for the Commission at large is
- 23 absolutely one of the things that we're hoping that the
- 24 subcommittees can identify and work with staff to
- 25 arrange and accomplish as it comes up.

1	Any other questions for the legal
2	subcommittee? Comments?
3	Okay, Mr. Miller, you have an opportunity
4	now to address the Commission.
5	I'll make a statement real quick. My
6	understanding is that the public comments for the
7	subcommittees was available during the subcommittee
8	meetings yesterday and that we are going to offer public
9	comments in the morning and before close of session this
10	evening. So the public comments on this discussion will
11	be able to be made, but we have it at the agendized time
12	at approximately 5:30 this evening or at the end of
13	sessi on.
14	AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm not sure that's really
15	appropriate. I think during the subject matters it's
16	more appropriate. But if you want to miss the
17	opportunity, then go ahead.
18	CHAIRMAN WARD: Certainly don't want to miss
19	the opportunity. That's why we're going to provide a
20	period of time at the beginning of every session, at the
21	end of every session for public comment. And I also
22	encourage you. I know you've been diligent at being at
23	our subcommittee meetings and you've been a great source
24	of comment for us. And if you're not able to stay until
25	the agendized time for public comments, then I encourage

- 1 you to please put them in writing and submit them to us
- 2 through the website, or you can call and make those.
- 3 But the problem is, if we open this time up for public
- 4 comments we'll never get through the agenda.
- 5 AUDI ENCE MEMBER: I understand.
- 6 CHAIRMAN WARD: So that's why we have to,
- 7 unfortunately, organize them.
- 8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You simply might want to
- 9 stop talking in acronymese and understand for the public
- 10 that VRA stands for Voting Rights Act. It's only been
- 11 mentioned casually.
- 12 CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you so much. I
- 13 appreciate that. Thank you.
- 14 Mr. Miller?
- 15 MR. MILLER: I think that was an excellent
- 16 in-depth summary of our meeting and, as such, I have no
- 17 other commentary to add.
- 18 CHAIRMAN WARD: Fantastic.
- 19 11: 30. Next up was the technical
- 20 subcommittee, but I'd like to propose that we go to
- 21 communications.
- 22 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I had a
- 23 misunderstanding regarding the agenda as well.
- 24 COMMISSIONER DiGUILLO: Is it not finance
- and administration subcommittee was actually scheduled

- 1 for --
- 2 CHAIRMAN WARD: But yesterday we discussed
- 3 moving, switching legal and finance due to the finance
- 4 subcommittee's recommendation.
- 5 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Oh, I'm sorry.
- 6 CHAIRMAN WARD: Because so much of their
- 7 agenda depends on what the other subcommittees came up
- 8 with, it made sense to move them to the end of the
- 9 slate.
- 10 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I'm sorry.
- 11 CHAIRMAN WARD: But due to trying to push the
- 12 agenda forward as much as possible, it seems like moving
- to communications might be an appropriate thing to do.
- 14 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: The only other
- 15 question that I had, Chairman, you had postponed from
- 16 Thursday item "M," which was training, and so I thought
- 17 we were under the impression that Mr. Miller, if I
- 18 thought this was his area, we were just going to throw
- 19 it under the legal, but unless you had some other idea
- 20 of where "M" was going to go since you postponed it from
- 21 yesterday.
- 22 CHAIRMAN WARD: That was my understanding,
- 23 too. Mr. Miller, I thought, was satisfied with the
- 24 Bagley-Keene di scussi on.
- 25 Did you have further Bagley-Keene

- 1 comments to make, Mr. Miller?
- 2 MR. MILLER: Well, there's always the
- 3 potential for further comment.
- 4 CHAIRMAN WARD: Okay, fantastic.
- 5 MR. MILLER: Having said that, while it looks
- 6 like a short and straightforward Act, it's sort of like
- 7 Bible verses where the minister continues to refer back
- 8 to that short phrase with additional insight every time.
- 9 That said, I think in light of our decision to have a
- 10 more fulsome training at the next Commission meeting,
- 11 and where we are in the agenda, it makes sense just to
- 12 hold that for now and try to do it in a comprehensive
- 13 way at our next meeting.
- 14 CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you, Mr. Miller.
- 15 Did the Commission at large have any
- 16 comments about Bagley-Keene?
- 17 And we were going to try to lump in the
- 18 rest of training towards the end of Saturday since we're
- 19 going to be short on commissioners.
- Did you have anything additional?
- 21 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Oh, I'm sorry.
- 22 Are we done with item "M"? Are you considering that
- 23 finished? Otherwise I have a question.
- 24 CHAIRMAN WARD: Go for it.
- 25 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Okay.

- 1 CHAIRMAN WARD: We'll tackle item "M" at this
- 2 point.
- 3 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: When you put
- 4 down here the sexual harassment and the ethics training,
- 5 did you have any idea -- frankly, I would like my -- to
- 6 be refreshed regarding our obligations. I thought that
- 7 there was some time limitations for the Commission
- 8 members to complete that, or at least there was some
- 9 suggestion -- well, the six months on the ethics, but
- 10 was there something else on the sexual harassment? In
- 11 other words, what else could we -- just refreshing our
- 12 recollection regarding the necessity for those
- 13 obligations. I'm assuming that's why it was on the
- 14 agenda, and just further clarification if there was a
- 15 time limit on sexual harassment like there was for
- 16 ethics.
- 17 CHAIRMAN WARD: Mr. Claypool has been tackling
- 18 and running this issue down for us diligently, so I'll
- 19 pass the mike to him.
- 20 MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes. And actually that item
- 21 was placed on because I wanted to just give you an
- 22 update on where we're at. The Secretary of State
- 23 continues to try to get that sexual harassment training.
- 24 Yes, there is a time limit on it. I believe it is less
- 25 than the time limit for the ethics training, but I don't

- 1 have that date in front of me. I don't believe we have
- 2 passed it as a Commission, but the Secretary of State is
- 3 still trying to decide whether she can offer it online
- 4 or whether we're going to need to have it in person.
- 5 Originally I believe Mr. Russo from the Bureau of State
- 6 Audits had said that it needed to be an in-person
- 7 instruction. I do not believe that that's the case with
- 8 the Secretary of State's office.
- 9 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes. Just to clarify, my
- 10 recollection is that Mr. Russo had suggested that it be
- 11 in person just to make sure. I think it was more a
- 12 compliance issue if we have the full Commission here and
- 13 take them away for an hour and do the training to make
- 14 sure everyone actually had it.
- 15 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: It was just more
- 16 efficient for time if we had one person address the full
- 17 Commission. Then everybody can have completed that
- 18 obligation.
- 19 MR. CLAYPOOL: Well, I believe the Secretary
- 20 of State's approach is to simply put it online because
- 21 it's going to be easier for them to line that person up.
- 22 And I think we're close to getting it online, and then
- 23 we'll probably have a check-in so each of you -- we'll
- 24 make sure that everyone gets that training.
- 25 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Is that part of the

ethics training, to see if we actually do the training? 1 2 MR. CLAYPOOL: It can look that way, can't it? 3 Thank you. COMMISSIONER YAO: I'm aware that there are a 4 5 number of law firms locally in this area that provides 6 this kind of training on a regular basis. Would you 7 like me to pursue and see if we can squeeze that in 8 before we convene on Saturday? Of if you'd like to 9 wait, that will be fine. But if you want to accelerate 10 that I can certainly make a few phone calls and try to 11 make that happen either today or tomorrow. 12 CHAIRMAN WARD: Are there special credentials 13 required, does staff know, for what would be a trainer 14 for sexual harassment and ethics at the government 15 level? 16 MR. CLAYPOOL: I don't know whether there are. 17 I would automatically assume that someone would have to 18 have some facility in providing those types of services. 19 I don't think that it would hurt us if that were a 20 possibility, but that's a Commission decision. 21 Secretary of State, again, has been working on it, and 22 clearly they have a lot of other things to do, so if it 23 went off their radar I'm sure that wouldn't something 24 that would bother them. But I don't know how quickly 25 someone could put that together. That's all.

1 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I just wanted 2 to clarify for purposes of the agendas that we've been 3 working with. We had a discussion item related to 4 trainings posted. I don't believe we had given public 5 notice that we were going to actually have a training. Is that correct? Would we run into any issues there? 6 7 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: While we're looking that 8 up, I don't think we should do something quickly, just 9 find somebody here and do it here even, if we're okay 10 with notice. I think there are particular issues around 11 being a State body and the kinds of issues that are 12 very -- we're not the normal employer/employee situation 13 that most of these training are geared to, having done 14 them for many years myself. This is, I think, slightly 15 There's just all kinds of technical things di fferent. 16 about definitions that are -- just would be very 17 tailored to this body. So I would suggest that we not 18 try and do something right now. 19 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I agree. The 20 Secretary is State is already underway, and if they're 21 so close to getting it up on the web, that would be 22 great. 23 MR. CLAYPOOL: We'll speak with Ms. Mejia of 24 the Secretary of State's office, and Kirk is going to

Susan M. Patterson, CSR 9461 Charleville Blvd, Ste 304, Beverly Hills, CA 90212 (310) 425-5716

work with us, too, to understand the exact requirements

25

- 1 for it so that we meet them.
- 2 CHAIRMAN WARD: Let's go ahead and move on to
- 3 item "M" and approval of meeting minutes, remaining
- 4 meeting minutes outstanding. I understand the last
- 5 session we had tabled that to give commissioners a full
- 6 opportunity to review the record. I was wondering if
- 7 there's any comments about those at this time or if
- 8 we're ready to move forward and approve those minutes.
- 9 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I do have a
- 10 question. Mr. Claypool, you had mentioned, if I'm not
- 11 mistaken, that there was some public comment regarding
- 12 the discrepancies in the minutes, and you had made
- 13 comments earlier that you reviewed, or your staff had
- 14 reviewed the video to make clarification regarding
- 15 certain comments. I think the confusion was between
- 16 Commissioner Raya and myself, and I was wondering was
- 17 that what you were referring to, that particular public
- 18 comment that questioned those inconsistencies?
- 19 MR. CLAYPOOL: No. Actually the confusion was
- 20 between the transcripts and -- what was printed in them,
- 21 and we had the transcripts changed to reflect what had
- 22 actually happened. So we went to the audio and the
- 23 video and made sure that we had the right person
- 24 referenced in the transcripts. It wasn't with the
- 25 minutes.

1 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: So were the 2 minutes corrected, though? Or the minutes were correct 3 in accordance with the video. So the public comment 4 that was made seeking corrections of the minutes were 5 not accurate because the transcript wasn't accurate. Yes. And if I said the minutes 6 MR. CLAYPOOL: 7 then I was incorrect. I was referring to the 8 transcripts, that there was a discrepancy between the 9 transcripts as to who had had an attribution, and we 10 have corrected that. But there were no discrepancies 11 with the minutes. 12 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: So the 13 individual who made the public comment could be assured 14 that the minutes accurately reflect the video because 15 his reliance on the transcript has since been corrected. 16 MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes. 17 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Thank you. Move 18 to approve. 19 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Second. 20 CHAIRMAN WARD: Excellent. 21 COMMISSIONER YAO: Could you specifically 22 spell out which minutes we're approving for the record? 23 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: These would be 24 the minutes from November 30th, December 1st, December

Susan M. Patterson, CSR 9461 Charleville Blvd, Ste 304, Beverly Hills, CA 90212 (310) 425-5716

10th, and December 15th of 2010.

25

- 1 CHAIRMAN WARD: At this time is there any
- 2 public comment regarding the approval of the meeting
- 3 minutes from the time periods listed? If so, please
- 4 come to the mike.
- 5 Fantastic. Seeing nobody approaching the
- 6 microphone, let's go ahead and take a voice vote. All
- 7 in favor of approving the minutes listed say "aye."
- 8 COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
- 9 CHAIRMAN WARD: Very good. And all opposed
- 10 say "no."
- 11 And any abstentions?
- 12 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yes. I wasn't in
- 13 attendance for some of those meetings so I'll abstain.
- 14 CHAIRMAN WARD: So noted. Thank you.
- 15 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I'm also abstaining.
- 16 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: I'm abstaining as well.
- 17 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I'm abstaining for the
- 18 same reason as well.
- 19 CHAIRMAN WARD: Very good. Thank you.
- 20 MR. CLAYPOOL: Chairman, could we have just
- 21 clarification on who moved?
- 22 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I moved and
- 23 Commissioner Malloy seconded.
- MR. CLAYPOOL: And to make sure we have the
- 25 abstentions?

1	(Raise of hands.)
2	COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And just to
3	clarify for the public, these minutes, this was 2010 and
4	thus we were not seated as a full Commission and thus
5	you note so many absences from that vote.
6	CHAIRMAN WARD: Pushing forward, does the
7	panel have I hate to cut communications short on
8	time.
9	COMMISSIONER DAI: There's one more action
10	item under your agenda, which is whether we, as a
11	Commission, agree that we will not do minutes moving
12	forward and instead and this is relevant to the
13	communications committee here is to try to do a
14	wrap-up, a daily wrap-up at the end of the day of our
15	accomplishments, decisions, actions, so that and have
16	that posted on a regular basis, given that we have a
17	full you know, live-streaming and we have transcripts
18	and all that, that this is an additional burden on
19	staff.
20	COMMISSIONER PARVENU: We make excellent
21	talking points, too, when we communicate.
22	CHAIRMAN WARD: Any comments about ceasing to
23	provide minutes since transcripts and video are present?
24	COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: I would simply agree.
25	CHAIRMAN WARD: Do I hear a motion?
	Susan M. Dattorson, CSD

1 COMMISSIONER DAI: I would like to move that 2 we not do formal meeting minutes moving forward. 3 CHAIRMAN WARD: Motion on the floor. Comment? 4 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I'll second. 5 CHAIRMAN WARD: There's a motion on the floor to take a vote to cease providing meeting minutes in 6 7 lieu of certified transcripts and video being available 8 on the website. 9 COMMISSIONER RAYA: May I ask a question of 10 clarification. Moving forward from this date, the date 11 that we just approved, from December 15th moving 12 forward? 13 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes. In other words, no 14 more formal meeting minutes other than the one we just 15 approved. 16 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Okay, thank you. 17 COMMISSIONER YAO: I think it would be good to be able to capture all the decisions that we make, and 18 19 the minute is such a vehicle. A minute is not a 20 duplicate of the transcript nor a duplicate of the 21 video, but a vehicle to capture whether we approve all 22 the decisions during that period of time. Lacking that, 23 we basically have to go back to the transcript or to 24 some other vehicle in order to recover those kind of 25 decisions. I just want to make sure that when we decide

- 1 to do away with the minute we're okay in terms of using
- 2 the transcript or other vehicles to recall the decisions
- 3 that we make. So that's -- I on a personal basis don't
- 4 have any issue on that, but lacking the summary of
- 5 decisions could be problematic in the long run.
- 6 CHAIRMAN WARD: If I may intercede really
- 7 quickly, I think one thing that would be -- just to
- 8 organize this discussion to do is to determine whether
- 9 or not official minutes are something we want to
- 10 continue with, and then bearing the result of that
- 11 conversation we can discuss things such as a meeting
- 12 wrap-up that staff would be able to update
- 13 accomplishments from each meeting or things like that on
- 14 the site. So we can discuss other vehicles to perhaps
- 15 provide that of a less burdensome nature. But if we can
- 16 continue with the discussion of whether or not we want
- 17 to continue to provide official meeting minutes and
- 18 determine that, we can move on from there. Is that
- 19 fai r?
- 20 COMMISSIONER DAI: Just to clarify,
- 21 Commissioner Yao, this is what I was saying, that the
- 22 public information committee already discussed less
- 23 burdensome ways of doing exactly what you just said,
- 24 which I'd be happy to allow our communications director
- to go into when we do the committee report.

1	COMMISSIONER BLANCO: If that's going to be
2	discussed can we wait until we hear what the suggestions
3	are? Because I share a similar concern about the
4	importance of capturing decisions in an accessible
5	format before you come to the meeting, et cetera. So
6	I'd like to hear what's been suggested before I do away
7	with the minutes.
8	COMMISSIONER PARVENU: And I just want to echo
9	what Commissioner Yao said. When I said they make
10	excellent talking points I had it in reverse order. I
11	thought we were discussing maintaining either minutes or
12	some sort of wrap-up. So I'm pleased with either one
13	because I don't want to be caught off guard and the
14	public not have those talking points available, freshly
15	available from some form of summary.
16	CHAIRMAN WARD: So we have a motion on the
17	floor and it was seconded, and I'm hearing a desire to
18	table that motion until after the communications
19	subcommittee has presented. Can I hear that motion?
20	COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So moved.
21	COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Seconded.
22	CHAIRMAN WARD: Okay. So the motion on the
23	floor is to table the motion to reconsider providing
24	official meeting minutes on the website until after the
25	subcommittees have been able to brief and alternative

- 1 vehicles are discussed.
- 2 Let's open that to public comment. Do we
- 3 have public comment on that issue?
- 4 AUDI ENCE MEMBER: Good morning, Commissioners.
- 5 Jim Wright again. I echo Commissioner Yao's concern
- 6 about presenting the decisions that are made. What's
- 7 interesting to me --
- 8 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Chairman -- I'm sorry,
- 9 Mister Wright. I think it's out of order for him --
- 10 unless you're speaking on the tabling motion. He's not
- 11 going to the original motion. Just procedurally, I
- 12 think. I give you the floor.
- AUDI ENCE MEMBER: A mi sunderstanding. Do you
- 14 wish me to proceed or not?
- 15 CHAIRMAN WARD: Please continue.
- 16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. As a citizen it is
- 17 important for me to understand the decisions that you
- 18 have made. It's not important to understand what
- 19 discussion has occurred up to those decisions or on
- 20 other matters. So if your minutes were to reflect only
- 21 the decisions, that would be enough for me.
- Thank you.
- 23 CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you for your comment.
- 24 Any panel discussion? Okay, all in favor
- of tabling the original motion until after subcommittee

1 presentations, raise your hand and say "yes." 2 COMMISSION MEMBERS: Yes. 3 CHAIRMAN WARD: All opposed? 4 Any abstentions? 5 I apologize to the Commission. I've kind of let the agenda get away from me. 6 We'll 7 tighten that up and push through the second half. 8 I'd like to propose that we go ahead and 9 break early for lunch and return back at 12:45. 10 let's do that. We're adjourned. 11 AUDI ENCE MEMBER: When is approximate 12 adjournment time today? 13 CHAIRMAN WARD: We're noticed until 6:30 14 tonight, but until we finish business today. So we 15 might move that forward a little bit, but the agenda 16 keeps us here until 6:30 at the latest. Thank you, sir. 17 (Recess from 11:47 a.m. to 12:54 18 p. m.) 19 CHAIRMAN WARD: Welcome back to the afternoon 20 session of the Citizens Redistricting Commission. We're 21 excited to see Karin Mac Donald out there, ready to help 22 us out today. 23 The next item on the agenda is the 24 presentation from the technical subcommittee, and I'd 25 like to invite Commissioner DiGuilio to catch us up.

- 1 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Okay. Actually I was 2 waiting on staff. They were making copies. And I don't 3 see Janeece here so I'm wondering if it's imminent or... 4 Part of it is because I think the 5 discussion point would be very helpful. We wrote up 6 some material that Gil and I have actually gone through, 7 and I think it would be very helpful if we had that 8 before we discuss this. Is there anything that I could 9 defer to? Is there any other little business, if we 10 just gave Janeece maybe a minute or more? I apologize. 11 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: While we're waiting can 12 somebody get up and dance for us? 13 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I have a quick 14 announcement. I think I grabbed most of the 15 commissioners over break, but tomorrow we'll be getting 16 to scheduling our March Commission meetings, and so as 17 of -- I'll put the cut-off as midnight tonight, if you 18 have not entered your availability and unavailability 19 for March. We'll just assume the calendar is completely 20 up to date and we'll use that to base our 21 recommendations for March schedules. Thank you. 22 CHAIRMAN WARD: Would you mind reviewing for 23 everybody where the calendar is located and how to find 24 it?
 - Susan M. Patterson, CSR 9461 Charleville Blvd, Ste 304, Beverly Hills, CA 90212 (310) 425-5716

Sure.

Soif

COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY:

25

- 1 you are logged into Google apps on your CRC email,
- 2 there's a couple different ways. If you worked with
- 3 staff or installed yourself so you have the shortcuts
- 4 actually on your desktop, there's a little link on my
- 5 task bar that looks like a calendar that I click on, and
- 6 when I open that the shared calendar pops up and I'm
- 7 able to navigate, look at the month. So in this case I
- 8 look at March. And I can go to any date and just click
- 9 on that date and it opens up an event and it says
- 10 "what." So in that case I put my initials, CGM,
- 11 Commissioner Galambos Malloy, and unavailable on
- 12 whatever dates I'm unable to meet, and then just click
- 13 "create event" and it then populates, and then other
- 14 folks are able to see your availability.
- Now, if you don't have the shortcuts but
- 16 you are able to open your redistricting email, when
- 17 you're actually in your redistricting email and you look
- 18 up at the top of your screen, it should give you some
- 19 different links you can click on. Up at the very top
- 20 left of your screen it says "mail" as the top left.
- 21 Then it has "calendar," "document," "sites," "contacts,"
- 22 et cetera. If you just click on "calendar," that's
- 23 going to open up your calendar in another window and you
- 24 can go through the same process there.
- When we go to break at 2:30 break feel

- 1 free to grab me. If you have any trouble opening the
- 2 Google calendar I can walk you through it.
- Thank you.
- 4 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Can I make a -- since
- 5 we're on computer information item of the agenda,
- 6 somebody mentioned the problem with the conversations in
- 7 Google, that was causing a problem, and I just wanted to
- 8 let folks that don't know this that you can go into the
- 9 settings in the email and change it. If you don't want
- 10 to have them all lumped together you can actually change
- 11 it to see it in the other, old-fashi oned way where you
- 12 would get each mail, email individually. Just go into
- 13 settings, scroll down, and you can get out of the
- 14 conversation mode, and that problem that people were
- 15 having with losing emails in the conversation, they can
- 16 just reset their settings.
- 17 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Thank you,
- 18 Commissioner Blanco. I didn't know that.
- 19 And, Commissioner Galambos Malloy, if you
- 20 don't see any non-available dates, that means I'm
- 21 available for the entire period, so I have nothing to
- 22 fill in.
- 23 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And I'll assume
- 24 as of midnight tonight that if somebody is not showing
- any conflicts that that means that they are available.

ı	i d arso suggest that for tomorrow s
2	scheduling purposes March is the minimum that we'd like
3	to have you weigh in on your calendar, but to whatever
4	extent you're able to go ahead and start looking at
5	April, start looking at May, these are the months where
6	our outreach efforts are really going to take precedence
7	and so it would help that we can just begin to forecast
8	what our schedules will be.
9	COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: Okay, I've come up
10	with an idea. Part of the bane of this for me was
11	dealing with Google Earth, or the Google Chrome, having
12	everything up in the Cloud. I couldn't get it out to
13	get printed. But apparently you can share documents.
14	So if we'd like to have the discussion, I've given I
15	think permission to everybody to go into documents and
16	to view to at least start us off so we can be a little
17	more efficient. There are three documents I've placed
18	there: the outreach coordination flow chart, the
19	subcomm, which I like to refer to as the subcomm
20	discussion points, and the quick guide to CRC outreach.
21	I would suggest opening up the outreach coordination
22	flow chart first. The only disadvantage to that is
23	there are no lines. Do you have access to that?
24	Okay. And I'm sorry, let me preface this
25	very quickly with it was a very late night, not a lot of

- 1 sleep, so I apologize for any things that are unclear or
- 2 typos, and I would really appreciate as we go through
- 3 any feedback that you may have in regards to this. I've
- 4 also had a chance to talk with Gil, and what we've
- 5 decided to do is, because technology and outreach really
- 6 do flow together so often, and we've talked with the
- 7 consultants as well, and we're going to kind of have a
- 8 free-flowing discussion a little bit. I'll present
- 9 first, then Gil, and I think along the way you'll see
- 10 how things kind of interact with each other, if that
- 11 will work for the commissioners.
- 12 Okay. So being a person who is a visual
- 13 person, I put together -- first of all, I wanted to
- 14 start with the flow chart so as we go into the
- 15 discussion you'll have an idea of where all these
- 16 players and aspects fall.
- 17 What we see is the subject experts, the
- 18 content drivers of what will happen with a lot of the
- 19 outreach activities, that being on the top row you'll
- 20 see technical consultants such as Karin Mac Donald, as I
- 21 mentioned earlier the VRA consultants, commissioners
- 22 also providing some of the content or decisions for
- 23 that, as well as others as needed. Those subject
- 24 experts would funnel down into the outreach meetings
- 25 which is -- there's a typo -- the project management, or

- 1 actually what's been suggested in a conversation was
- 2 coordinator, the outreach meeting coordinators. And
- 3 that would be, under this type of outline would be the
- 4 Center For Collaborative Policy, CCP. They would all
- 5 provide them information and the feedback to CCP, who
- 6 would then be able to develop the material and start
- 7 structuring some of the meetings. They would coordinate
- 8 those efforts.
- 9 And then below that, if you look below it
- 10 there's actually -- there's logistical consultants, the
- 11 CCE. And I don't know what that stands for actually.
- 12 It's a sister organization of CCP. But they actually
- 13 get on the ground, find the locations, make sure there's
- 14 enough tables, chairs, all that. And they would be then
- 15 reporting as well to the project manager coordinators,
- 16 as well as the means/services providers, translation
- 17 services, interpreters, online/offline support, all
- 18 those things that happen. We'll also -- back to the
- 19 coordinator. And the outreach partners, including
- 20 making sure that we are on the same page with our
- 21 partners and we are utilizing what they're doing.
- So you can see, again, the coordinator,
- 23 the management of what's going on, CCP, would take all
- 24 of these. And since we had made the decision, as Dan
- 25 had mentioned, to take some of that, what he had

- 1 suggested as staff, and instead to contract that out,
- 2 this would be an opportunity for all the consultants to
- 3 provide their expertise and have these actual outreach
- 4 meetings be coordinated in a central location.
- Now, this would also involve -- there's a
- 6 line that goes to Dan, who would be the one that would
- 7 oversee the interactions between the contractors, as
- 8 well as CRC staff who would be probably providing some
- 9 of our public information, our outreach efforts to make
- 10 sure we're coordinating with the efforts of the outreach
- 11 group. And we would make sure -- I put on the far right
- 12 the commissioners, and that way there was a line that
- 13 went from Dan to make sure Dan kept in touch with the
- 14 commissioners, as well as there's a line from the
- 15 project managers to the commissioners so that we can
- 16 keep that flow of information. So I know it's kind of
- 17 hard looking at this online without particular lines,
- 18 but that's an idea. So as we go through this maybe you
- 19 can refer back to it.
- The next document I wanted to talk about
- 21 was the quick guide, the quick guide one. And this came
- 22 about because it became very evident yesterday when we
- 23 were in a discussion that -- we had presentations from
- 24 Karin as well as CCP, and we realized one of the first
- 25 things we need to do is just get on the same page in

- 1 terms of terminology and defining the players and
- 2 responsibilities, because there's a lot of different
- 3 aspects going on out there.
- 4 So the first thing was to define who the
- 5 players are, the outreach consultants, and the first
- 6 ones being the technical consultants, Karin. And I've
- 7 started to use some acronyms. KMD would be Karin
- 8 Mac Donald. And there's some description there of what
- 9 she would be doing, some of the services, her expertise.
- 10 I went down to project management, the
- 11 Center for Collaborative Policy, again to assist in the
- 12 implementation of the open hearing process, and I will
- 13 kind of defer some of their speciality to Gil in the
- 14 discussion later on. Again, realizing that a lot of the
- 15 subject input, the requirements of technology and the
- 16 Voters Rights experts, would all funnel into the
- 17 coordinator to be able to make sure that what we were
- 18 doing in the outreach system was on par.
- 19 Again, there would be a meeting logistics
- 20 coordinator, and I left room there because if I ever
- 21 find out what CCE stands for I can put that in. But,
- 22 again, as I said, it's a sister organization to CCP,
- and, as they had mentioned, that when they had worked
- 24 for Ditas on the census it was -- they were the ones who
- were on the ground doing the legwork, the small details

- 1 that Peter so graciously did, and all our eyes rolled
- 2 back and said I can't determine whether we need a skirt
- 3 or a microphone or whatnot. So they would be the ones
- 4 who would actually go and scout locations on a regional
- 5 and they'd come back to CCP and say, "Here are some
- 6 options. Based on the parameters that you need, here
- 7 are your possible meeting locations, "wherever we hold
- 8 our actual outreach meetings.
- 9 And again VRA counsel to be determined
- 10 and others.
- 11 And on the bottom I just put a note about
- 12 the necessity, again, for all these consultants to work
- 13 collaboratively together and to make sure that
- 14 communication is ongoing between our staff, themselves,
- and with the commissioners and subcommittees.
- Now we get into defining outreach, and
- 17 we've been using this term. It occurred to us we've
- 18 been using "outreach" and it has a lot of different
- 19 aspects to it, so I wanted to go through and clarify for
- 20 the rest of the Commission what we've been discussing in
- 21 the subcommittees. And it's been broken down into two
- 22 main groups, and the first is the educational -- let me
- 23 back up again. I've referenced the terminology that's
- 24 been used by Karin, which is "educational meetings," and
- 25 the terminology "community workshops" has been

- 1 referenced by CCP.
- 2 So there are some handouts I think that
- 3 were supposed to be distributed, so I've put in there
- 4 the reference to those documents in terms of the
- 5 sections, so you can go back on your own leisure and
- 6 look at the actual documents from Karin. And I also
- 7 believe that CCP will be handing out some things and you
- 8 can refer to how they described these as well.
- 9 So, basically, again, the educational
- 10 meetings are informational, including a training
- 11 component. It does not require commissioner attendance.
- 12 Of course you can attend if you'd like to in terms of an
- opening statement, but it wouldn't be for feedback.
- 14 Approximately four hours in length, weekends, nights, to
- 15 try and capture as wide a range of public as possible.
- And how they've envisioned, both Karin
- 17 and CCP, is something along the lines of -- and this is
- 18 something I'd like the Commission to consider -- but
- 19 seven educational meetings. And these were -- the sites
- 20 were mirrored for the redistricting assistance sites,
- 21 with the exception that Berkeley you could put in, but
- there's been a lot going on already in that location so
- 23 we may not necessarily have to do that again.
- 24 And again the Salinas/Watsonville, I
- 25 could have Karin talk about that later. Although it's

- 1 not a high population area, but its proximity to
- 2 Section 5 counties, both Monterey as well as -- you'd
- 3 have to come in from the central valley to capture the
- 4 other ones, but it is in geographic proximity. And
- 5 there is a map of that as well in Karin's material. I
- 6 wish I had that for you right now. And, again, there's
- 7 just some additional aspects of that.
- 8 So, again, those are the educational
- 9 meetings. Those can happen immediately.
- The next thing, though, is the input
- 11 hearings, and I think that's -- input hearings, as Karin
- 12 has termed them and public hearings as CCP has
- 13 mentioned. And this is really the data collection and
- 14 testimony given to us as the Commission. This does
- 15 require commissioner attendance. It can be conducted
- 16 jointly. The suggestion was made by consultants that it
- 17 can be made jointly with our regular business meetings,
- 18 but, if that's so, the suggestion was to save
- 19 commissioner business to the very end so we could be
- 20 respectful to people.
- 21 The educational component of this, which
- 22 I think has been something that commissioners have asked
- 23 for frequently, is referred to, the CCP, as the
- 24 prehearing educational sessions. And that would be
- 25 included as well to give participants, or attendees an

- 1 overview.
- 2 I'll skip some of the other things.
- 3 There's some methodology for why these nine -- there's
- 4 some nine regions that were suggested. There's some
- 5 methodology that Karin provided. You can look at it
- 6 later. But basically the nine regions that Karin has
- 7 broken them down into, you can see these regions in
- 8 terms of population centers. I think CCP maybe
- 9 suggested more. There's one more maybe on the north
- 10 that the Commission may want to consider as well, too,
- 11 geographi cally.
- 12 So, again, these would be -- looking at
- 13 the nine different regions, then, as Karin had mentioned
- 14 to us in her presentation back in Sacramento, there are
- 15 three phases, as she envisions it, as what we're kind of
- 16 trying to capture. The phase one would be the before
- 17 the census data is released. Our initial meetings, if
- 18 we want to hit the ground running as soon as possible,
- 19 that would be phase one, before the census data is
- 20 released. Phase two would be as we're drawing the maps
- 21 using the census data and initial public input. It
- 22 would be the opportunity where I think this is -- Gil
- 23 and I had talked about this. This would be the area
- 24 where we'd probably get the most attendance because we
- would be presenting some options and we'd be getting

- 1 feedback and a lot of back and forth. The final phase,
- 2 phase three, would be simply when we finalize the maps
- and we're going back to the community one more time.
- 4 So the potential structure for the public
- 5 input hearings, if you wanted to follow this model with
- 6 nine regions, if you look at at least one meeting per
- 7 phase as kind of the bare minimal starting point, you're
- 8 looking at 27 meetings. If you looked at something
- 9 where -- if in anticipation of phase two being an area
- 10 where there will be a lot of discussion you may want to
- 11 have at least two meetings or more. So, again,
- 12 exponentially you go to 36 and so on.
- 13 I think the other thing to note with
- 14 this -- and I know Commissioner Parvenu, this was a
- 15 point that he had raised, too -- was during these public
- 16 input hearings that they would rotate within each
- 17 region. So during the different phases, phase one may
- 18 be held in one location in one region and then it would
- 19 move to another location for the next phase, so
- 20 hopefully we could reach as much geographic outreach and
- 21 diversity as possible within those phases. And I will
- 22 Let CCP talk about the additional outreach as they
- 23 described it. It was the commissioner-initiated, some
- 24 online resources and offline.
- So my intention with this was to give you

- 1 something you could look back at and say, when we're
- 2 talking about these issues, this is what we're
- 3 referencing, and hopefully get us on the same page with
- 4 some suggested terminology.
- 5 So, lastly, this is where we'd like to
- 6 get some feedback from the Commission as a whole. The
- 7 discussion points for the full Commission is the last
- 8 one.
- 9 So I've done a lot of talking. I've
- 10 handed you some material. Now you have it. I just
- 11 wanted to get some feedback from you as we go through
- 12 this about if the structure we provided so far makes
- 13 sense to you, and any corrections, revisions, and
- 14 additions.
- 15 Maybe it might be helpful to discuss the
- 16 scheduling of the outreach meetings. As I mentioned
- 17 before, the educational workshops can begin immediately.
- 18 And, as I understand it, we have it scheduled, the first
- 19 one, tentatively for the February 26th, that Saturday.
- 20 And Karin again can maybe speak to this later on, but
- 21 this is apparently something that can be rolled out
- 22 pretty quickly, particularly in conjunction with the
- 23 rollout of the redistricting assistance centers, too.
- 24 So if that were the case we could at least schedule that
- 25 first one, with the remaining six to seven workshops

- 1 taking place soon, within March, to get that up and
- 2 runni ng.
- In regards to the public input and
- 4 testimony hearings, I tried to do a little who, what,
- 5 when, where, why, how, but late at night things get a
- 6 little blurry, so bear with me.
- 7 The first -- and this is a very key
- 8 point. This is a starting point for us. We have to
- 9 determine the level of commissioner participation at
- 10 these meetings, at these hearings, whether it's going to
- 11 be full attendance or partial attendance. Gil raised
- 12 the point -- Commissioner Ontai raised the point that
- 13 there may be a legal aspect if we need to be there, but
- 14 also just commissioner desire. Because obviously with
- the full Commission it's going to significantly reduce
- 16 the amount of meetings we can do. If it's a partial,
- 17 then that will drive to some degree what the consultants
- 18 will do with how to structure these meetings and where
- 19 to structure them.
- 20 So once we have determined that, we'd
- 21 like to task the consultants with beginning to plan
- 22 phase one meetings immediately so that we can get those
- 23 noticed as soon as possible. We see those meetings
- 24 taking place beginning in mid-March -- I'm sorry, the
- 25 "when" would be beginning in mid-March and going to the

- 1 end of let's say April. And these, again, could be done
- 2 simultaneously with educational workshops. And also,
- 3 then, we would need to I think almost at the same time
- 4 begin planning the phase two because I think that's
- 5 where probably the most number of meetings will actually
- 6 need to take place. And part of that is also so we can
- 7 get the logistical subcontractors to find locations in
- 8 these spots so they can be noticed in addition to the
- 9 times.
- 10 Where. I think the other point I'd like
- 11 the commissioners to consider would be if you would like
- 12 to discuss a strategy for the actual outreach meetings.
- 13 There have been some suggestions we could start in the
- 14 north and work down if we're doing it on an individual
- 15 region basis. If we're going to do it on a partial
- 16 commissioner attendance, we could do it simultaneously
- 17 within each region. There's also been some discussion
- 18 starting at the Section 5, VRA Section 5 counties and
- 19 working out. I think these things, once we get this
- 20 nailed down, we can give some marching orders to the
- 21 consul tants.
- 22 Again, regionally -- so let me take a
- 23 pause there before we go into some of the last ones, the
- 24 finance, training, and additional points, and throw it
- 25 out based on some of those -- the information I

- 1 provided. And let me let Vince add some things, as
- 2 well.
- 3 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Relative to the
- 4 Commission participation, I would think at least at the
- 5 initial two or three of them we should have the whole
- 6 Commission there, because there's going to be a lot
- 7 Learned. And once we gather that understanding of
- 8 what's going on, then we can decide whether we need to
- 9 attend all of them as a full Commission or whether we
- 10 could split them up and increase the number that we
- 11 could do and things of that nature. But it would be
- 12 hard, based on the public input that we received at the
- 13 subcommittee discussion, to translate that into terms
- 14 that might be sufficiently meaningful to the whole
- 15 Commission. So I think there's a lot to be learned by
- 16 all of us participating in the initial ones, and then we
- 17 could decide, based on that experience, whether we think
- 18 we have to attend all of them as a Commission or whether
- 19 we can split it up.
- 20 COMMISSIONER DAI: I would agree that there
- 21 probably is a lot to be learned, but I wouldn't want to
- 22 hold up our planning based on that. I mean I think we
- 23 can advise that most commissioners try to attend the
- 24 first couple, but I think that we had discussed before
- 25 at previous meetings about splitting up and dividing and

- 1 conquering and just having at least three commissioners:
- 2 one republican, one democratic, one decline to state, as
- a minimum group.
- 4 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: If I may, on
- 5 that point, Commissioner Ontai, can you tell me the
- 6 context which your concern regarding the participation
- 7 of the full Commission came about? In other words,
- 8 there seemed to be some concern about if the full
- 9 Commission didn't appear at these meetings whether we
- 10 would have -- there'd be some legal restriction on our
- 11 ability to vote. I mean certainly the information in
- 12 the public outreach would be available to us if we were
- 13 not present, probably online or Google Cloud or there'd
- 14 be some other ways that Commission members that couldn't
- 15 attend the public outreach meetings. So in what context
- 16 did that issue come up?
- 17 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: My thinking on that was
- 18 when we publish a trial map, our first draft map, I
- 19 believe Bagley-Keene regulations require that we have at
- 20 least nine commissioners present at any of these formal
- 21 public meetings. And let's say -- we have fourteen
- 22 commissioners here. Let's say thirteen of these
- 23 commissioners are at one of these meetings, formal
- 24 meetings where we're discussing a map for let's say
- 25 Riverside County. And then subsequently in August when

- 1 we have to finalize that map and submit that, is it a
- 2 problem, is it going to be a problem for that
- 3 commissioner that was not present at a critical moment
- 4 when the communities in Riverside County were discussing
- 5 and giving us feedback on their map? Is it going to be
- 6 a problem, that that one commissioner who was not
- 7 present at that hearing would present a legal issue to
- 8 us?
- 9 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: So you're
- 10 looking at the later phases, not outreach meetings
- 11 necessarily where we're gathering public input.
- 12 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: That's right.
- 13 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Okay, I'm sorry.
- 14 So that's further down the road. Okay, thank you.
- 15 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: But is your concern that
- 16 the commissioners that weren't present gathering the
- information and they're then voting on the information
- 18 as contained in the map?
- 19 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: Yes. I believe the
- 20 ex post facto regulations or ruling is that if this
- 21 missing commissioner was not privy to all of the
- 22 information that was presented at this community
- 23 meeting, would that be a challenge for that individual
- 24 commissioner to vote on that final map for that
- 25 district.

- 1 CHAIRMAN WARD: If I may, can I invite Kirk
- 2 into the conversation to see if he has any expertise in
- 3 day three?
- 4 MR. MILLER: I understand the concern and that
- 5 in other settings that might be the case. I don't
- 6 believe that the law that's governing this process would
- 7 preclude that commissioner from participating, for a
- 8 couple of reasons. In particular, you do have access
- 9 through the systems we've developed to all of that
- 10 information, and that's fundamentally the important
- 11 thing. And then, you know, it's not quite like a trial
- 12 where we're each evaluating the credibility of a witness
- in terms of how someone presented to the public.
- So for this purpose an official meeting,
- 15 if you will, a noticed meeting would require a minimum
- 16 of three commissioners to participate. But that's
- 17 really record building. And when you vote on the maps
- 18 we would expect everyone to be present, to have reviewed
- 19 the record, to have heard experts present on the
- 20 particular map that's at issue, the pros and cons of
- 21 that map. And, using that methodology, I think you
- would be complying with the requirements of the Act.
- 23 CHAIRMAN WARD: Great. Thank you, Kirk, for
- 24 that.
- 25 I'll get right to you. I understood

- 1 Karin Mac Donald might be making a presentation. I
- 2 understand she's not. I just wanted to invite her maybe
- 3 to join at the microphone, and she stepped out. Okay.
- 4 We'll get her expertise on the record as well, since
- 5 she's been one of the primary people that's been
- 6 recruited to help drive some of these planning. Since
- 7 we have her here in the building it would be nice to
- 8 have her as part of the conversation. Thank you.
- 9 Commi ssi oner?
- 10 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: The issue about where
- 11 we get started and the notion that we might all want to
- 12 attend some of the initial meetings, it might better,
- 13 rather than going way up north, is to pick a spot like
- 14 Fresno where it's easy for the entire Commission to get
- 15 to. That might make it easier for us to all show up.
- 16 It would be less expensive and things of that nature.
- 17 So maybe the first couple should be more in the central
- 18 part of the state so that we could all find it easier to
- 19 get there.
- 20 COMMISSIONER YAO: In addressing the
- 21 attendance issue, in reading the text that you have, you
- 22 want to start by mid-March and you want to finish by
- 23 early April. That basically is about three weeks, and
- 24 we have nine meetings, so that pretty much dictates
- 25 three meetings a week. And we're about to address our

- 1 business meeting in March. I think we're probably not
- 2 going to have as many days as you have scheduled us. So
- 3 I think the full Commission attendance is really out of
- 4 the question altogether.
- 5 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And I will defer. I
- 6 don't know, Gil, if you would like to do -- well, at
- 7 some point I think Commissioner Ontai will also present
- 8 a draft of a timeline that he's shown, actually that you
- 9 saw, but it might be nice for the full Commission to see
- 10 how tight -- you're right -- how tightly and compact
- 11 those meetings are going to have to be.
- So, again, I think if the Commission
- 13 recognizes that they'd like maybe the first two, as
- 14 Commissioner Barabba suggested, the first couple, the
- 15 full Commission wants to participate, that's doable.
- 16 But if we really wanted to go out there and reach a lot,
- 17 increase our level of outreach, then we have to divide
- 18 and conquer, based on time.
- 19 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Another
- 20 consideration based on the structure that's being
- 21 proposed here is that a higher share of outreach
- 22 meetings would fall upon the decline-to-state
- 23 commissioners because of the actual numbers of the
- 24 composition. So if we really wanted to have one from
- 25 each: democratic, republican, and decline to state,

- 1 logistically I think we'd have to map that out because
- 2 we would be going to more hearings overall.
- 3 CHAIRMAN WARD: Is that a requirement that
- 4 we'd agreed needs to be filled, that there would be one,
- 5 one and one?
- 6 COMMISSIONER DAI: It's not a requirement. It
- 7 was just something we had discussed as probably in the
- 8 spirit of the Act.
- 9 CHAIRMAN WARD: Was that a formal motion made
- 10 that was passed, does anyone recall?
- 11 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: No, I think it
- 12 was a principle that we discussed as a potential goal.
- 13 COMMISSIONER DAI: It was not a formal motion.
- 14 CHAI RMAN WARD: Thank you.
- 15 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: So am I hearing that
- 16 the -- I guess I'm hearing a little bit. And maybe
- 17 Karin wants to discuss this, too. I believe her
- 18 recommendation was for the full Commission to attend as
- 19 many meetings as possible, but I think we're trying to
- 20 balance that with the desire for commissioners to be out
- 21 there. So maybe Karin wants to address that, but it
- 22 would be nice to have some consensus as to what we do
- 23 with that so we can move forward.
- 24 MS. Mac DONALD: Yeah, thank you.
- Yeah, I think it's very important that as

- 1 many of you as possible attend the input hearings
- 2 because that's going to let you rely a little less on
- 3 staff interpretation, at some level, and you will all be
- 4 privy to the same information. Because there's just one
- 5 thing about reading it in a transcript or having it
- 6 noted it down, because of course we'll have note-takers
- 7 and we'll have people summarizing, and we'll also have
- 8 this input database where everything will be captured.
- 9 But it's really a different story when you're really
- 10 standing there and you're interacting with the public
- and the public can really just make their point.
- We had a really great case here
- 13 yesterday, in fact, during our hearing when a gentleman
- 14 came in and told us about his community of interest.
- 15 And, you know, I mentioned it at the time as well. It
- 16 would look completely different on a piece of paper as
- 17 it did actually yesterday during the interaction. So
- 18 think you really have to give some thought to that.
- 19 I think during the educational hearings
- 20 when we're going out and doing these workshops you don't
- 21 necessarily have to be there. But the input hearings,
- 22 that's a different story. So I don't know how much I
- 23 can urge you to really look at your calendars and really
- 24 try to come out. There will be just a lot of decisions
- where you have to weigh perhaps conflicting testimony,

- 1 and what you see in these hearings will be very
- 2 important.
- 3 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Aguirre?
- 4 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes. And I would
- 5 concur with what Karin is saying. But it is a very
- 6 short timeline, and although not all fourteen
- 7 commissioners might be available to go to every corner
- 8 of California for these input hearings, certainly
- 9 another standard might be that as many as possible
- 10 should try to be there. And if it so happens there's
- only three that are available to go, given the schedule
- 12 that is provided, so be it. But certainly I agree that
- 13 so-called the gestalt of being present as the
- 14 information is provided really imprints the seriousness
- and the urgency that will be communicated by the public
- 16 presenters.
- 17 COMMISSIONER YAO: Just a question on the
- 18 educational meeting. How are we going to be able to
- 19 manage not accepting inputs from the public?
- 20 MS. Mac DONALD: Well, I think the public at
- 21 those hearings can perhaps start developing some of the
- 22 input. And you have not really set up a structure,
- 23 aside from the hearings, by which you will accept input.
- 24 I'm assuming there's going to be an address where people
- 25 can mail it. I'm assuming there's going to be an email

- 1 address. There may be some other web interface by which
- 2 the public can submit input. What I'd like to not have
- 3 happen is lots of consultants and lots of moving pieces
- 4 at these hearings and then somebody just passing a piece
- 5 of information on, assuming that that's going to go to
- 6 you and there is no channel set up by which that's going
- 7 to happen. So I think we can absolutely help the public
- 8 develop things. Then there has to be some sort of an
- 9 avenue set up by which they can actually get the
- 10 information to you.
- 11 COMMISSIONER YAO: Yeah. Have we set up
- 12 public meetings of this nature where we do not allow the
- 13 attendees to input back to the presenter? In other
- 14 words, it's a one-way communication. How do we get this
- 15 message out saying, "We don't want your input." Or,
- 16 "We're not allowed to accept your input during this
- 17 educational meeting."
- MS. Mac DONALD: Well, for one, if no
- 19 commissioners are there and these are really educational
- 20 events and they're like training workshops like the ones
- 21 that we've been doing for a year now, then even though
- 22 this is something that you're organizing, I'm not sure
- 23 that there will be an expectation that you will be
- 24 receiving this input, especially not if we have a
- 25 handout that says, okay, so if you have this ready to go

- 1 or if you need to go back to your community and refine
- 2 it, this is how you then get it to the Commission so
- 3 that the Commission will have it officially.
- 4 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Commissioner Yao, I
- 5 think you're referring to something else, correct, which
- 6 was the issue that -- I think there was some instruction
- 7 or advice given to the Commission at one point that when
- 8 we receive public input that we're not allowed to engage
- 9 in a back-and-forth with the people that are making the
- 10 public comment.
- 11 COMMISSIONER YAO: Right.
- 12 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I think that's the
- 13 concern.
- 14 COMMISSIONER YAO: I'm not challenging it.
- 15 I'm just basically saying that if that is what we agree
- 16 to, we probably should not have any commissioners attend
- 17 the educational session. Because if we're there and we
- 18 refuse to accept public input, that by itself is
- 19 problematic, okay? But if we agree not to attend any of
- 20 the educational sessions, where we have no ability to
- 21 receive the input, then let's send that message out and
- 22 work to that agenda.
- 23 And I guess, as I said, I'm not
- 24 challenging it. I just want to make sure that we have a
- 25 process where we can manage the expectation.

1	CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Dai, your light
2	was on and went off because you've been waiting so long.
3	COMMISSIONER DAI: I was just going to provide
4	some context for the public and just to remind the
5	commissioners from our past meetings that originally
6	when we talked about splitting up in teams of three,
7	that was when we were working with a much larger number
8	of public hearings that we had been discussing that were
9	in the kind of pre-map drawing period. So I just wanted
10	to concur with Commissioner Aguirre's suggestion, which
11	is that we try to have as many commissioners as
12	possible, but also I would not want that to hold things
13	up. So if someone can't attend, someone can't attend.
14	CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Filkins Webber?
15	COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I think what the
16	issue is and I concur with Commissioner Yao. Is it
17	possible that when we provide notice of these
18	educational workshops we call it simply that. It's a
19	workshop and not a public hearing. So when we provide
20	notice or information on our calendars we can put a
21	paren on there that this is not a public hearing, or,
22	you know, please be advised the public input hearings
23	are further on the schedule or something of that nature.
24	So despite the fact that if there is a commissioner who
25	wishes to attend, it won't be in a formal setting such

- 1 as this.
- 2 And I'm certain that you've done this
- 3 before, and I'm certain counsel -- oh, he just left --
- 4 would probably concur, if we're not considering it a
- 5 public hearing, it's just a workshop, there might be a
- 6 difference as far as there may not be a mandate for
- 7 allowing public comment when it's really an educational
- 8 workshop.
- 9 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Aguirre?
- 10 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: And that speaks to the
- 11 clarity of our communication with the public. We have a
- 12 communications director and a format that has been
- developed by the outreach committee on consultants that
- 14 essentially will describe kind of each phase of the
- 15 process. And if the public is clear with that, each of
- 16 those phases, and how the public can participate, then
- we will be ahead of the game.
- 18 The other thing has to do with
- 19 participation of the commissioners. One suggestion was
- 20 that you could have -- because we want to honor,
- 21 wherever we go in California, that perhaps one
- 22 commissioner can be present to kind of give the welcome,
- 23 say a little bit about the Commission, where we are at
- 24 this point, clarify that we're not there to take input,
- 25 that the input is going to be at a later date, perhaps

- 1 in that region scheduled for that date at that time at a
- 2 certain location. Kind of provide that clarity. And
- 3 then simply kind of like walk out the door and then let
- 4 the consultants that are handling the educational aspect
- 5 of that educational workshop, then they take over.
- 6 The other -- in the absence of a
- 7 warm-body commissioner at these, one suggestion was to
- 8 kind of do a video of one or two or three commissioners
- 9 where you would kind of communicate the same
- 10 information, thereby providing, quote unquote, a face to
- 11 the Commission in the absence of -- one of us that would
- 12 essentially recognize the value of the participation of
- 13 the public and, therefore, you know, meet the objective
- 14 of reaching out, even if it's in a symbolic level.
- 15 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner DiGuilio?
- 16 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: Just address a couple
- 17 issues. Going back to Commissioner Filkins Webber's
- 18 point, that's part of the reason why it was very
- 19 important to get the terminology correct. It's very
- 20 important to distinguish between educational workshops
- 21 and the public input hearings. So I think that would be
- 22 the terminology we as commissioners need to start using
- even when we're discussing this so that way we don't
- just say "outreach," because that means different things
- depending on what we're talking about.

1 And to go back as well, part of the 2 reason I tried to do a little bit of a flow chart was, 3 in your mind -- and I think CCP will discuss it a little bit more, too -- it was hard as a technical subcommittee 4 5 to just talk about the technical aspects because it's intertwined with what's going to happen. But if you 6 7 envision this as the technical consultant, Karin, she 8 She knows what we need to utilize. knows the data. 9 knows how to capture, to collect the information, all 10 the technical aspects. It wouldn't be her job to run 11 the meetings to make sure all the people are getting 12 their information to -- to be presented. It would be 13 more the project coordinator to be able to make sure 14 that everyone has the information that they need to know 15 for the educational aspects, that they're prepared and 16 ready when their name is called to come up to the 17 microphone and say, "This is what I'm going to present." 18 They'd be able to give their information clearly and 19 precisely so that we could capture it, so we could 20 hopefully have a better format for capturing that. 21 Those information could be developed by the coordinator 22 so that we can streamline this process so hopefully all 23 of it can move very quickly. 24 But, again, it's this idea of trying to 25 play to the strengths of our consultants. So Karin

- 1 would be able to drive the process for what's needed.
- 2 The project coordinators can implement that, and we as a
- 3 Commission can get back what we needed.
- 4 MS. Mac DONALD: May I chime in for a second?
- 5 That's absolutely correct. I wanted to add to this
- 6 actually a couple of things. One was, just going back
- 7 in the discussion to earlier to how many of these input
- 8 hearings we should have, I'd actually also -- I would
- 9 like to suggest that there is one input hearing during
- 10 each phase that just focuses on statewide issues. So we
- 11 should add that. So that groups that are working on a
- 12 statewide level have a forum in which to present the
- 13 information. I think that's an appropriate thing to
- 14 consider as well.
- 15 In terms of what happens at these
- 16 educational workshops -- and I should tell you what I
- 17 just passed out. So your very hands-on executive
- 18 director and I just collated these documents. These are
- 19 the documents I developed in collaboration with
- 20 Commissioner DiGuilio and Commissioner Barabba. And the
- 21 first document says draft 2-10-11. This is basically --
- 22 this is a lot of the more detailed information that
- 23 Commissioner DiGuilio has summarized in her flow chart
- 24 and has presented to you. But there's just a little
- 25 more detail in there, if you'd like to refer back to it.

- 1 And then the appendices basically refer to the different
- 2 methodologies of selecting the meetings and the
- 3 hearings.
- 4 You will see that in this first document
- 5 we actually did distinguish between the types of
- 6 meetings and hearings, so the first one is called, in
- 7 this document, an educational/background meeting, not a
- 8 hearing, and then the input ones we're calling hearings.
- 9 So, you know, the hearing just, you know, implying that
- 10 there's really something else going on.
- 11 In terms of the educational and
- 12 background meetings, what I had envisioned is that we
- 13 have -- we, through the Redistricting Group at Berkeley,
- 14 have really developed trainings, very extensive two-day
- ones and then also shorter ones. And I don't want to
- 16 put anybody on the spot, but there are a few attendees
- 17 here who have gone through both and they might be able
- 18 to speak to them. And we've also received some feedback
- 19 on how to change certain slides and whatnot -- thank
- 20 you, Kathay -- and, you know, incorporated all of that
- 21 over time. So there's basically a packaged training
- 22 that's already been tested that a lot of people have
- 23 gone through that we can adapt to just launch very
- 24 quickly at these workshops.
- 25 And, you know, we've trained everybody

- 1 from just, you know, activists and people that know
- 2 something about redistricting and Voting Rights, and
- 3 people that haven't. So people that are professional,
- 4 people that are not. So it's basically across the
- 5 board. So we tailor them somewhat, but the basic
- 6 package is there.
- 7 So we would need a timeframe, just decide
- 8 upon where we should put the emphasis, and then this is
- 9 ready to go.
- 10 What I think with respect to communities
- of interest is that a lot of people need to go home
- 12 after they have the information and then they need to
- 13 develop that information. So there will be some people
- 14 I think that will come to these educational hearings
- 15 that already know. They know their neighborhood group.
- 16 They know exactly where their neighborhood is. And they
- 17 will be ready to give us something right there, and they
- 18 would like to make sure that you receive that
- 19 information. They may be able to just develop it right
- 20 there, perhaps geocode something or, you know, just
- 21 develop the technical information.
- 22 But most others, I'm going to guess --
- 23 and that's an educated guess -- are going to take the
- 24 information we provide to them, take the handouts, and
- 25 then go home, talk to their communities, figure this all

- 1 out, and then submit it to us later. Maybe some of them
- 2 will go to the technical assistance centers; maybe
- 3 others will just do it in some other fashion. It
- 4 depends on how elaborate they want to be and of course
- 5 how much access they have to these assistance centers,
- 6 because obviously we only have six.
- 7 So I think that's how it's going to go.
- 8 I don't think everybody is going to just leave us with a
- 9 piece of information. And I open this clarifies things
- 10 a little bit.
- 11 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Yao?
- 12 COMMISSIONER YAO: I support the educational
- 13 workshop. What I'm about to suggest is that since I
- 14 think from the previous discussion we're isolating the
- 15 commissioners from the bulk of the educational
- 16 workshops, is it possible that we can just develop the
- 17 training material and ask the community groups that are
- 18 throughout the state to conduct the, whatever, two-,
- 19 three-, four-hour training on behalf of this Commission
- 20 and allow this Commission to get involved with the input
- 21 meeting without getting involved with the educational
- 22 meeting. Because I don't know what kind of value added
- 23 that we're providing to that process by getting involved
- 24 in the educational process. Because I think previously
- 25 we have talked about using the community groups who

- 1 would support us in doing that.
- 2 CHAIRMAN WARD: Karin, go ahead.
- 3 MS. Mac DONALD: Just from what I know is that
- 4 the community and advocacy groups that are out there,
- 5 they're not exactly overfunded, so they have basically
- 6 received some level of funding and they're doing what
- 7 they can to already educate certain parts, their
- 8 constituents, certain groups that have a stake in
- 9 redistricting and whatnot.
- The way I think we had envisioned these
- 11 particular meetings are to be somewhat supplemental and
- 12 perhaps reach a broader group of people that are perhaps
- 13 not included. I think even if you would give this
- 14 training material and all that to the community groups,
- they would still need funding, obviously, and I don't
- 16 know if they have the capacity to just go out and do
- 17 this, because everybody is stretched very thin.
- 18 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Filkins Webber?
- 19 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Two points,
- 20 maybe since we're on this topic. I agree with
- 21 Commissioner Aguirre's proposition that it puts a face
- 22 of this Commission out there at the workshops and gives
- 23 the public acknowledgment that this is an official
- 24 workshop, that the material being presented is presented
- in a fashion that this Commission has agreed on and that

- 1 we're educating the public. So that's why I find and
- 2 agree with Commissioner Aguirre's suggestion that at
- 3 least one person, if not a video, if it's impossible for
- 4 us to get there.
- 5 So in addressing Commissioner Yao's
- 6 suggestion, or inquiry as to why it might be important,
- 7 I think it's extremely important so it's not an advocacy
- 8 group. This is an actually an official commissioned
- 9 workshop that this Commission has authorized, and I
- 10 think it gives more credence to the public that we're
- 11 serious, that we've put this forward as an educational
- 12 workshop. And that's why I think it would be important
- to at least have one commissioner, and if it's
- 14 impossible then some backup video. That's in response
- 15 to Commissioner Yao's question.
- 16 CHAI RMAN WARD: Commi ssi oner Barabba?
- 17 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I would think that we
- 18 would want to make sure that the education was
- 19 consistent in a manner that when we get the input back
- 20 we don't have to worry about somebody having been taught
- 21 to do something in a different way. So I would think
- that we would want to stay with what's been proposed
- 23 here because it provides a consistent educational
- 24 system.
- 25 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Ontai?

1	COMMISSIONER ONTAL: Yeah. With respect to
2	the various types of input that we'll be collecting, we
3	just handed out a timeline. Did you all get a copy of
4	that? If you could turn to the second-to-last page, I
5	did a matrix.
6	Karin, do you have this?
7	CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Ontai?
8	COMMISSIONER ONTAL: Can you hear? All right.
9	And what I did was I tried to determine
10	how and at what level commissioners would participate,
11	given the different nature of input that we would be
12	receiving. So looking at the left-hand corner where it
13	says Commission activities, I have CRC business meetings
14	at one group and a definition of what that would entail,
15	and then the census data mapping meetings, and then
16	there's description of what that entails. And then the
17	last two are non-mapping outreach meetings. I separated
18	them in terms of informing the public about Commission
19	process, timeline, participation. And the last one is
20	informing the public about redistricting matters, the
21	importance of value, definition, things of that nature.
22	And then the next column over where it
23	says commissioner attendance, I suggested that, given
24	the Bagley-Keene Act, that the first two business
25	meetings and the mapping would require at least nine

- 1 members of the Commission at any one time.
- 2 And the last, bottom two, non-mapping
- 3 outreach and non-mapping educational, I'm assuming that
- 4 at least one or two Commissioners can be present.
- 5 And then if you follow the rest of the
- 6 columns to the right, you'll see that information
- 7 sharing and distribution can be done by other
- 8 organizations as well. We have the staff. Obviously
- 9 they can do that. Paid consultants will be doing that.
- 10 Non-profit partners, like Greenlining and Women's
- 11 League, they have been doing guite a bit of the
- 12 educational piece already. Then we have the community
- 13 organizations. This would be local groups. Like in
- 14 San Diego I have at least fifteen organizations that
- would like to participate in the non-mapping outreach
- 16 and educational meetings. Then you have the third
- 17 option, which might be a videotape piece that we could
- 18 do and distribute that to public agencies like schools
- 19 and libraries. Commissioner Aguirre had mentioned that.
- 20 And of course we have the general public.
- 21 So there's different levels of
- 22 communicating this information, but the most important
- 23 one I think is where the Commission attendance would be
- 24 legally required and what would give us the flexibility
- to spread ourselves over the next seven and a half

- 1 months.
- 2 CHAIRMAN WARD: If I may quickly,
- 3 Commissioner DiGuilio, since you're briefing for the
- 4 subcommittee, is this part of the scope of what you guys
- 5 discussed, the actual -- I'm just concerned. I don't
- 6 know if this bleeds into outreach or --
- 7 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Yes, this is
- 8 Commissioner Ontai's outreach schedule.
- 9 CHAIRMAN WARD: So this is outreach, okay.
- 10 COMMISSIONER DIGUILLO: And I think -- again,
- 11 to try to level the playing field with terminology, I
- 12 think -- we had this discussion yesterday, right,
- 13 Commissioner Ontai, in terms of what you've been terming
- 14 census data mapping meetings would be -- I'm sorry, no,
- 15 it was the other one.
- 16 If you go back to -- just if you're
- 17 looking at this in terms of what we've been discussing
- 18 for the technical, what Commissioner Ontai has termed on
- 19 the second page outreach before the trial map would be
- 20 known as phase one. The outreach during trial map
- 21 creation would be phase two. And the outreach
- 22 alternatives to trial map would be phase three, just to
- 23 be consistent.
- 24 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: That's correct, yes.
- 25 COMMISSIONER DIGUILLO: So I think what

- 1 Commissioner Ontai has done is given us a good visual of
- 2 the tight deadlines in terms of months. So that's how
- 3 it's related.
- 4 CHAIRMAN WARD: Okay.
- 5 COMMISSIONER DiGUILLO: And, again, I'm sorry.
- 6 We kind of tried to merge this only because it overlaps.
- 7 So I hope that answers your question.
- 8 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: Yes. And the point I'm
- 9 making is we're struggling here with semantics and we
- 10 have to come to some common definition.
- 11 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So I have a question.
- 12 I'm struggling with how many days in the calendar. So
- 13 we're talking about nine meetings, input meetings now.
- 14 I'm not even talking about educational meetings.
- 15 According to these materials, nine meetings in March,
- 16 right?
- 17 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: That is being suggested.
- 18 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Phase one.
- 19 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: Yes, that is being
- 20 suggested.
- 21 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: In addition to
- 22 educational meetings. And we need to consider what I
- 23 didn't see on the timeline, was where our business
- 24 meetings fit in. So I think that's an added element to
- 25 the timeline. Because we'd have nine meetings in March.

- 1 I believe our next Commission meeting will be March 9th,
- 2 correct? That's two weeks from the next Wednesday. I
- 3 mean maybe, maybe.
- 4 So we have to consider the business
- 5 meetings in this timeline and figure out when -- if we
- 6 can have these business meetings to coincide with the
- 7 other meetings, which on the one hand promotes full
- 8 commissioner participation but it takes us away from the
- 9 idea of being able to have small groups, and if we go
- 10 back to the small groups then we add a meeting for
- 11 busi ness.
- 12 And also in here is that phase two. We
- 13 will not only be doing the phase two meetings but we
- 14 will be doing the beginning of the map drawing. And
- 15 there will be nine meetings before, in April and May,
- 16 along with the meetings that -- I think business
- 17 meetings will begin to merge with the mapping meetings.
- So I guess my question is, I think we
- 19 need to -- it's not a question. We need to incorporate
- 20 the business meetings into the schedule, see where that
- 21 leaves us, and how that affects the full Commission
- 22 participation and the issues of notice, if we're going
- 23 to do it along with, you know, other meetings.
- 24 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: And that is correct, yes.
- 25 CHAIRMAN WARD: If I could interject, I guess

- 1 what I was trying to guery the Commissioner about was --
- 2 or the subcommittee, are we now talking outreach?
- 3 Because if we are we have CCP folks that are actually
- 4 going to take the stand and they're going to be able to
- 5 assist us in resolving these issues. I want to focus us
- 6 on the technical conversation so we can get through that
- 7 and then move more into outreach.
- 8 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think part of the
- 9 issue is, in order to talk about technical needs, we
- 10 need to have some decisions made by the Commission. So
- 11 including, as, yeah, Commissioner Filkins Webber
- 12 mentioned, is we need to decide officially to hire a
- 13 consultant so we can actually task them. Because I know
- 14 that Ms. Mac Donald has more than used up hours that she
- 15 hasn't been even paid for yet. So we need to be tasked
- 16 with hiring a consultant.
- 17 And then once we do that, because the
- 18 technical aspects are going to be driving the outreach,
- 19 we need to have a clear understanding, if it's
- 20 acceptable to the Commission in this format, that we
- 21 allow the consultants to do the educational. I would
- 22 suggest just taking that off our plate. If we agree to
- 23 it, say the consultants will do that. They will present
- 24 something to us, but let them develop it.
- Then I would suggest that the input

- 1 hearings, the public input hearings, we need to decide
- 2 as a Commission again those parameters of how many and
- 3 where so we can task the technical consultants to
- 4 develop, to then work with our project coordinators so
- 5 that they know the material. Because our project
- 6 coordinators, CCP, are fantastic at implementing these
- 7 things, but they don't know the subject material, and
- 8 that has to come from the technical side, which would be
- 9 Karin.
- 10 So, again, I'm trying to back up. Before
- 11 we can move too far into outreach we need to have some
- of these questions answered.
- So will that help you in terms of what
- 14 you need to do to move forward, too?
- MS. Mac DONALD: Yes, absolutely.
- 16 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Based on the
- 17 information that we have received in Sacramento from
- 18 Ms. Mac Donald and CCP, is it the technical
- 19 subcommittee's recommendation that this Commission today
- 20 consider a full contract, and are we even permitted to
- 21 do it based on our limitations right now, so that we
- 22 could direct Ms. Mac Donald to move forward on the
- 23 educational hearings? Because it seems a little
- 24 esoteric to talk about -- we do need to talk about all
- of these things, but I'm a practical person. Can we

- 1 hire her? Has the subcommittee made a recommendation to
- 2 this Commission to do so? So, then, just as you had
- 3 suggested, let's move past the educational workshop and
- 4 let's start looking at schedules and moving forward on
- 5 that.
- 6 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Just taking a verbal, a
- 7 visual count of the subcommittee, we would encourage
- 8 that we retain the services of Karin Mac Donald.
- 9 And the other point I wanted to make was,
- 10 it's concern about the business meetings. What we will
- 11 be doing will be the business of this Commission, which
- 12 is getting the job done, rather than what we've been
- doing, which is trying to get organized to get the job
- 14 done. So I would think that the focus on business
- 15 meetings will become incorporated into these input and
- 16 outreach meetings and that we should be less concerned
- 17 about how many business meetings we have and more
- 18 focused on what we're going to be doing about getting
- 19 these lines drawn.
- 20 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: One possibility
- 21 we had talked about in previous meetings was the idea of
- 22 having one business meeting in the month of March or
- 23 somehow greatly condensing the work that we would need
- 24 to do as a full Commission during that month, so I think
- 25 there are options that we can work to devise.

- 1 CHAIRMAN WARD: Was your question fully
- 2 answered, Commissioner Filkins Webber? You had a legal
- 3 question, I think, didn't you?
- 4 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Well, I didn't
- 5 have a legal question. But should this Commission move
- 6 forward at this point with a motion to retain --
- 7 Ms. Mac Donald, could you repeat the name
- 8 of your -- because I know you wear two hats, or maybe
- 9 more than that.
- 10 MS. Mac DONALD: Repeat? I'm sorry?
- 11 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Your company.
- 12 MS. Mac DONALD: Yes, it's Q2 Data & Research.
- 13 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Q2?
- 14 MS. Mac DONALD: Q2, stands for Qualitative
- 15 and Quantitative, Data & Research.
- 16 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Okay, Q2 Data
- 17 Research.
- 18 MS. Mac DONALD: Data & Research, LLC.
- 19 CHAIRMAN WARD: I had one question before, but
- 20 Commi ssi oner Barabba?
- 21 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: A question to staff:
- 22 Is that organization one that we can retain under the
- 23 procedure that you've been using?
- MR. CLAYPOOL: So you're referring to?
- 25 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Karin.

- 1 MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay, yes. It's one that we
- 2 can do. It would have to be a procurement. So one of
- 3 the things that's been suggested is that you could
- 4 authorize me to enter into that, or start that contract
- 5 or enter into it as soon as we receive procurement
- 6 authority, if that's what you wish to do, so that you
- 7 could -- we could do it that way.
- 8 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Thank you.
- 9 COMMISSIONER YAO: Question for executive
- 10 director. Without information on the cost, without
- information on the schedule, how can this Commission
- 12 enter into a contract just from the pure direction of
- 13 this Commission, saying go and enlist this group or this
- 14 contractor to start performing work for us? I guess I
- 15 need to understand the process.
- 16 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: If I could, I think
- 17 we're authorizing him to enter into a contract, and he
- 18 would have to come back to us with that level of detail.
- 19 COMMISSIONER YAO: So we're directing staff to
- 20 enter into an exclusive contract.
- 21 MR. MILLER: I was trying to envision a manner
- 22 that would permit you to take a next step, but not the
- 23 ultimate next step, in the manner you're most
- 24 comfortable doing. For example, if the details, and
- 25 they're not details, the fundamentals of the contract

- 1 that you're referring to such as cost, time, product to
- 2 delivery, were available to you and you were in a
- 3 position to make a judgment on the totality of those
- 4 elements, you could authorize Mr. Claypool to enter into
- 5 the contract at a future time when we have the delegated
- 6 authority, we have whatever authority the State has
- 7 still to convey to us in order to make the contract
- 8 operational. Now, you may not have enough information
- 9 today to wish to take that step.
- 10 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Is there any
- 11 option for such as what we had done at the prior meeting
- 12 of this Commission, to direct or enter into a contract
- 13 with Q2 Data for at least the minimum? And if you could
- 14 provide staff maybe the potential for cost on at least
- 15 getting -- moving forward on a schedule for the
- 16 educational workshops. Is there some manner in which we
- 17 could limit it until we get to the point where we can
- 18 enter into the full contract after we have information?
- 19 Is there some option there, Mr. Miller, where we might
- 20 be able to break it down like that?
- 21 MR. CLAYPOOL: There's certainly options for
- 22 an interim contract to assume some duty that's different
- in scope of work from the original work that's been
- 24 performed, and that would be different from the final
- 25 work that you had put in place. So we can do that. I

- 1 think that we will have the cost figures that you're
- 2 thinking of. We'll have a pretty good idea, actually
- 3 we'll have a completed scope of work and a very specific
- 4 idea of what this is going to cost before we have these
- 5 workshops, I believe before they even begin, because we
- 6 need to have that phase put into place after we have our
- 7 next meeting in Sacramento. So I mean we're talking --
- 8 I think we're talking about a fairly short timeframe.
- 9 But as far as covering the interim costs,
- 10 certainly we can do the same thing we did with the 50
- 11 hours and then pay for that portion just knowing that it
- would be a scope of work that we would end up having to
- 13 pay for anyway in a completed contract. But I
- 14 understand that you want to see the cost first.
- 15 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioners, I'm being urged
- 16 to request a five-minute bio break, so we're going to do
- 17 that at this time. We're going to pick this up at five
- 18 after the hour.
- 19 (Recess from 1:58 p.m. to 2:15 p.m.)
- 20 CHAIRMAN WARD: Okay, the time being 2:15, a
- 21 quarter after the hour, we're back in session. The
- 22 quorum is present.
- 23 And at this time I'd like to go ahead and
- 24 turn the microphone pack over to Commissioner DiGuilio
- 25 who initially outlined four main points that came out of

- 1 the subcommittee meeting for technology that require
- 2 some consensus this meeting. So I'd like to turn it
- 3 back over to her and focus the conversation on those
- 4 four items.
- 5 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: Okay. I think in an
- 6 effort to try to move the process forward and hopefully
- 7 be able move on from technology and talking specifics
- 8 about outreach, I think it would be helpful for the
- 9 technology committee to have agreement from the
- 10 Commission on moving ahead -- first of all, the first
- one would be to move ahead with the educational
- 12 meetings. And hopefully those can be completed in
- 13 March.
- 14 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I think that's a useful
- 15 thing. And I actually -- during the break I asked Karin
- 16 if she had an estimate of what that would cost us. So,
- 17 with your consent, I would like to ask her to give an
- 18 outline of what those educational meetings would cost.
- 19 MS. Mac DONALD: Okay, the educational
- 20 meetings are going to be a real bargain for you because
- 21 the Irvine Foundation has already paid for most of them.
- 22 So we had as part of the contract to do the outreach
- 23 centers, we also had an educational piece in there. And
- 24 we had envisioned doing four more regional workshops, as
- 25 we called them, I think, in the proposal. And they're

- 1 very similar in scope and design to what we're talking
- 2 about here. So if we can collaborate with CCP, then
- 3 pretty much four of them are already paid for.
- And I have one caveat, which is I'm not
- 5 sure if we spent the travel money on used furniture for
- 6 the centers, because this is all the kind of
- 7 not-so-well-funded-center issue. And I have an
- 8 additional supplemental budget request into Irvine. So
- 9 if we get more money from Irvine obviously you don't
- 10 have to pay for it. But, in addition, if -- so for each
- 11 additional workshop I would say, in terms of staff cost,
- 12 not more than \$3,000.
- 13 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Now, that would be your
- 14 cost, correct?
- 15 MS. Mac DONALD: Yes, that's the technical
- 16 part.
- 17 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Do you have an estimate,
- 18 or does staff have an estimate of what the CCP component
- 19 would add to that for the additional four meetings?
- 20 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: I believe, if you
- 21 wouldn't mind holding off, I think they're going to do a
- 22 presentation on that very briefly. And they have a very
- 23 detailed proposal.
- 24 COMMISSIONER FORBES: For just educational
- 25 meetings?

1	COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: For educational
2	meetings, input meetings in general
3	COMMISSIONER FORBES: Right, I understand
4	that, but I'm asking just for educational meetings.
5	COMMISSIONER RAYA: It's in your handout.
6	COMMISSIONER FORBES: All right, thank you.
7	CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Ancheta?
8	COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Karin, just for
9	clarity's sake, I know you wear different hats, and I
10	know they're closely related. So just for clarity sake,
11	obviously you've got the Statewide Database, which is a
12	State agency, and then you have your consulting company.
13	And I want to be I think other people would like to
14	be clear, too, about when it's a Statewide Database
15	activity versus a contract with your company.
16	And the issue that's related to this, and
17	I think it's been raised in written public comment, is
18	because of the collaborative that Irvine is funding, and
19	some concerns of the public that based on certain
20	organizations who will do advocacy work regarding
21	certain types of maps, there may be need to be some
22	distinctions or lines drawn in terms of the different
23	members of the collaborative. Again, that's a larger
24	discussion, but I want to be clear about where it's the
25	Statewide Database that's doing certain things and you

- 1 as a contractor are doing certain things and where those
- 2 costs are eventually showing up.
- 3 CHAIRMAN WARD: If I may interject as chair on
- 4 that matter, that's a question that's excellent but is
- 5 addressed at a later time. Right now -- we can address
- 6 that under contracting and other issues. Right now
- 7 we're trying to stay on point one.
- 8 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I understand that, but
- 9 because I'm really -- when you said it's already paid
- 10 for --
- 11 MS. Mac DONALD: I could do it in one minute
- 12 very qui ckl y.
- 13 CHAIRMAN WARD: By all means, please.
- MS. Mac DONALD: I'm standing here on vacation
- 15 time from the Statewide Database. So when I'm here
- 16 talking to you I'm not on the Statewide Database. The
- 17 Statewide Database actually also does not work on the
- 18 Irvine piece. We kind of separated that out because
- 19 that was a grant, and we call it the Redistricting Group
- 20 at Berkeley Law.
- 21 So the Statewide Database really does
- 22 like data provision, and that's really all we do. We do
- 23 not do redistricting consulting there. We do not do
- 24 anything else but really just database, giving data to
- 25 the public and helping them just kind of access the

- 1 data.
- 2 So when we got this grant from Irvine, we
- 3 founded the Redistricting Group at Berkeley Law, because
- 4 we moved over to Berkeley Law about a year and a half
- 5 ago. And there are some people from the Warren
- 6 Institute that are part of the Redistricting Group and
- 7 all of that.
- 8 So basically when we're doing the
- 9 outreach centers and also that educational piece, that's
- 10 Berkeley Law. And this is kind of the reality of being
- 11 at a university where you have to rely on soft money and
- 12 you have to just bring in various, various grants or
- 13 projects to keep your people employed on some level.
- 14 I have done redistricting consulting.
- 15 I'm staff at Berkeley, and staff at Berkeley has no
- 16 limitations on doing any kind of outside business. And
- 17 I've verified that various times, and most recently
- 18 three weeks ago. So I have that in writing actually
- 19 from the law school.
- So when we're doing consulting, like
- 21 right now when I'm standing there, this has really
- 22 nothing to do with that. I'm really educating you about
- 23 what's going on at the Redistricting Group at Berkeley
- 24 piece, because that's going to save you some money, and
- 25 because also I've engaged in dialogue with the Irvine

- 1 Foundation, and they're very interested in working with
- 2 the Commission. Because not only does that save money
- 3 but it also really helps us all be on the same page and
- 4 get more people engaged.
- 5 So I've been very, very clear on which
- 6 hat I am wearing, and I actually really appreciate the
- 7 question. And if you want to know more I will tell you
- 8 all about it.
- 9 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yes. And, again, I was
- 10 simply losing track on some of that.
- 11 MS. Mac DONALD: I should say one more thing.
- 12 I actually just hired the manager for the
- 13 Berkeley Redistricting Center. She came on today, is
- 14 her first day. Well, I worked with her last night. And
- she's actually going to be supervising the other
- 16 centers, so I will have very little to do with the
- 17 supervision of the other centers. That's Tamina Alon,
- 18 and she's sitting in the office now.
- 19 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So can I go back to --
- 20 does that answer your question?
- 21 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yes.
- 22 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: I think maybe this
- 23 question will be raised at the end. It's my fourth
- 24 point in regards to actual contracting with consultants.
- 25 But going back to the first one, can we agree as a

- 1 Commission that starting these educational meetings is
- 2 the first task at hand? Are you comfortable with
- 3 setting those up for the technical committee to go ahead
- 4 and do that?
- 5 COMMISSIONER YAO: I think I, along with
- 6 Commissioner Forbes, what is the total cost for the
- 7 educational meeting? Does anyone have that number? I
- 8 mean we're about to approve something to start on a
- 9 process that we can't backtrack, okay, and if I don't
- 10 know what that total cost is -- I have the partial cost
- 11 that was identified from the podium. You said that I
- 12 have to wait until further to find out what the rest of
- 13 the cost is. I don't know how I'm going to vote on
- 14 this.
- 15 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: Could I suggest that
- 16 we could limit it to saying that we would like to go
- 17 ahead with the educational meetings so that we can task
- 18 the consultants with developing a schedule that can be
- 19 presented to us at our next meeting so we would get the
- 20 schedule and the costs associated with that to some
- 21 agree?
- 22 CHAIRMAN WARD: What I understand that she's
- 23 asking -- and I could be wrong -- is she's asking us if
- 24 we're interested in having these training meetings.
- 25 They don't want to put together a plan and a budget, a

- 1 cost proposal for meetings that we don't even want.
- 2 From what I understand, is you're just
- 3 simply asking do we, as a Commission, want to engage in
- 4 an educational meeting process. If we do, then what
- 5 they would like to do is put together a proposal for how
- 6 much those would cost and so forth, so that would be
- 7 forthcoming. Where I don't believe you're asking us to
- 8 approve an expenditure for these training meetings to
- 9 happen at this time. Is that correct?
- 10 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: It's my understanding
- 11 that the only one that we have tentatively scheduled is
- 12 for February 26th, but beyond that we haven't developed
- 13 a schedule. And I do think we're running into the issue
- 14 of having enough time to agendize things, so I think if
- we had something in our hands at the next meeting in
- 16 terms of actual schedule as well as a scope of work and
- 17 a budget, then we could make that decision.
- 18 I know it's a bit of a horse before the
- 19 cart, the cart before the horse here. Maybe Karin can
- 20 give -- she's given a little bit of the numbers on her
- 21 part, and I guess the question is do want to get into
- 22 the numbers on the CCP. And there may be -- as you saw
- 23 on this, there's a lot of elements. If you looked on
- 24 that flow chart, there are a lot of different people
- 25 that don't have their numbers here. We won't have the

- 1 number for CC if we want to have the logistical aspects.
- 2 We don't have it if we need translation/interpretation
- 3 services, things along those lines. There's some
- 4 questions we may not be able to answer right now in
- 5 terms of budget.
- 6 But I think if we want to move on this we
- 7 should just have agreement if we want to do these
- 8 educational meetings.
- 9 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Raya?
- 10 COMMISSIONER RAYA: We were handed a document
- 11 a few minutes ago, and this is another draft and it
- 12 includes -- I know that's somebody else's document. But
- 13 the difficulty I'm having I think is the same. I think
- 14 I'm kind of echoing Commissioner Yao. We're trying to
- 15 keep this in some kind of like compartmentalized
- 16 consideration, but it doesn't really work. Well, it
- 17 doesn't work for me; I'll just say that. Because we
- 18 have some numbers, and we were given another number.
- 19 And, I don't know, it is difficult to say. In concept,
- 20 yes, everybody wants to do the educational workshops,
- 21 but I think, you know, somehow I need things to mesh a
- 22 little bit more.
- 23 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Barabba?
- 24 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: My concern is that here
- 25 we are in February, and it's going to be very soon

- 1 before we start drawing some maps. If we have to have
- 2 the exact cost of everything we're going to do before we
- 3 authorize it, we're not going to make it. Now, we have
- 4 spent a lot of time finding an executive director with
- 5 experience in this area. It seems to me we should be
- 6 directing him to get a contract put in place that makes
- 7 sense within the law and all the other procedures that
- 8 we have.
- 9 This first part is going to be the least
- 10 amount of money we're going to spend, and we can't get
- 11 going unless we get it started. So I would suggest we
- 12 have some confidence in our executive director to hammer
- 13 out a contract that we can be proud of and get the thing
- 14 goi ng.
- 15 CHAIRMAN WARD: Mr. Claypool?
- 16 MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes. I think it's important,
- 17 and I have a sense of where Commissioner DiGuilio wants
- 18 this to go. What we're talking about here is having a
- 19 presentation by each one of these entities to say, "For
- 20 my part, this is what it will cost."
- 21 Yesterday when I spoke, or when I
- 22 actually spoke with the finance committee I said what
- 23 we're looking at right here is trying to get an estimate
- 24 of what this core is going to cost us. So we could
- spend a lot of time right now saying so for the outreach

- 1 within the meeting CCP is going to charge us this amount
- 2 and for the part that we would get from the
- 3 Statewide Database will be this piece and then as a
- 4 consultancy we would get this piece, and try to mesh
- 5 that. But that I think is what we're aiming at for our
- 6 next meeting.
- 7 What we're looking for right now is to
- 8 say in principle we agree that we want to have these
- 9 outreach meetings, and then when we come to you at the
- 10 next meeting we're going to say this is the scope of
- 11 work that we're talking about; this is the cost. These
- 12 are what these will cost you. I don't believe we're
- 13 asking right now -- you are not approving the payment
- 14 for these services or anything else. You're simply
- 15 approving that scope of work that you believe needs to
- 16 be done.
- 17 And then at our next meeting we'll be
- 18 talking about are we all -- is this the scope of
- 19 work we -- is this what we can agree to pay for this
- 20 scope of work. That's what I think we're shooting for
- 21 right here.
- 22 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Then what you're looking
- 23 for, are you talking about just the educational
- 24 component or are you talking about the whole input
- 25 component as well right now?

COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I was going to break 1 2 it down to, first of all, separate them. Are you okay 3 to move forward with the educational meetings? If so, in theory we can ask the consultants then to come back 4 5 with a detailed scope of work based on the seven 6 educational meetings. 7 My next question was going to be 8 regarding the scheduling of the public input hearings 9 and what I need to get from the full Commission to move 10 And that would be just those two things. forward. 11 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I think -- I agree with 12 Commissioner Barabba. We can't wait so long for this. 13 So I think, personally, that we make a decision to go 14 forward with the educational meetings, and at our next 15 meeting in Sacramento you'll come back with a projected 16 cost of that part of our outreach program. 17 I also think that as we look at all these 18 potential meetings, I mean there's 27 meetings or 36 19 meetings or however many there are, I think it would be 20 very helpful for me personally to have a schedule for 21 the next two to three months set out without regard to 22 whether we can make them, because I think to try and 23 work our schedule is impossible. I think we have to 24 come up with a schedule: This is where we're going to 25 be, or we're going to try to be, on these dates.

- 1 it's up to us to be there. And some of us will be and
- 2 some of us won't. And that's just the way the chips
- 3 fall. But to try to massage our schedules, I think
- 4 that's an impossible task.
- 5 So those would be my two recommendations
- 6 in our next business meeting.
- 7 MR. CLAYPOOL: And I believe that we are
- 8 talking about the same thing. What you are looking for
- 9 is structure for where we're going, and I believe that
- 10 the outcome of this session has to be in agreement as to
- 11 what that structure should look like. It's exactly what
- 12 Commissioner DiGuilio just outlined.
- We need to have an agreement as to what
- 14 our outreach plan is going to look like. We have to
- 15 have an agreement as to what our public input process is
- 16 going to be, and then we have to have some agreement as
- to what we're going to do regionally when we're finished
- 18 with our final maps and so forth.
- 19 So as a Commission I believe that you are
- 20 putting these pieces together. We've already talked
- 21 about needing to get the cost estimates for the Voting
- 22 Rights Act attorneys. We're talking about putting
- 23 together contingency. I've spoken earlier about needing
- 24 the cost for staff. All of this has to come together so
- 25 that we can come back to you at the next session and say

- 1 this is the price tag for this effort, and that will
- 2 then give us the information we need to go to the
- 3 Department of Finance and to go to the legislature and
- 4 say please release the money that's in the budget. We
- 5 already have this, and this is what we need
- 6 additionally. And I think each one of these contractors
- 7 is doing a very good job for us by breaking it down by
- 8 meeting and by breaking down the components.
- 9 If we don't, for some reason, get that
- 10 money, then we know where we have to scale back to. But
- 11 the first thing I think we need to know is, in your
- 12 collective mind, in your vision, what do you think it
- 13 looks like at the level you think it should be as a
- 14 process. We're going to work those numbers for you, and
- 15 part of it will be exactly what we're saying: this many
- 16 meetings.
- Now, will we have them scheduled out that
- 18 way by the next session? I don't think so. I don't
- 19 think we can say you'll be in Watsonville on March 23rd.
- 20 But we do know from a process standpoint that you have
- 21 the expectation of doing this many meetings, and that's
- 22 something we can plan around. And that's what I think
- 23 Commissioner DiGuilio is looking to put into place.
- 24 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Aguirre is next,
- 25 but I was in line. I wanted to go ahead and make a

- 1 motion at this point, propose that we agree in principle
- 2 to have training meetings and direct staff to solicit
- 3 proposals for options on how to make that happen, to
- 4 include budget and other concerns.
- 5 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: I would be in support
- 6 of that motion and I would second that motion by further
- 7 stating that, you know, we're trying to come to an
- 8 agreement on the concept itself, agreement on the
- 9 concept. And that concept includes us deciding that
- 10 we're going to go out there and we're going to say this
- 11 is what we're all about. Then we're going to go out
- 12 there again and say, "We were here before, so now we
- 13 need information, some input from you. We'll be back."
- 14 Going out again and saying, "All right, we heard you.
- 15 This is kind of where we're going." And then coming
- 16 back, doing that work, and then going back and saying,
- 17 "This is what we came up with. You've got fourteen
- 18 days, whatever, to give us some final input." That's
- 19 the concept. That's the concept, right?
- 20 So I think the request is can we agree on
- 21 that concept. I think it's pretty simple.
- 22 As far as the money goes, even though
- 23 Karin has not given us any figures at this point, I
- 24 think with the outreach committee, the documents that
- 25 they will be presenting certainly outlines what the

- 1 money angle is going to be on that particular process,
- which is more than \$3,000 certainly.
- But, anyway, so I would second that
- 4 motion.
- 5 CHAIRMAN WARD: In light of your input, I'm
- 6 actually going to withdraw my motion and I'm going to
- 7 ask Commission DiGuilio to please make a motion based
- 8 off of what the request of the subcommittee is at this
- 9 time.
- 10 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: Okay. I'd like to
- 11 make a motion that the Commission agree in concept to
- 12 the educational meetings so that the consultants can
- 13 develop a proposal for our consideration at our next
- 14 meeting.
- 15 CHAIRMAN WARD: Okay, we have the stated
- 16 proposal on the table. At this point further panel
- 17 di scussi on? Commi ssi oner Yao?
- 18 COMMISSIONER YAO: I'm sensitive to the
- 19 schedule. I'm sensitive to all the work that's ahead of
- 20 us. But I'm afraid we're taking a very bad approach to
- 21 this. There's no such thing as getting a little
- 22 pregnant. What we're about to do is enter into an
- 23 exclusive contract.
- Now, hear he me out. Hear me out. Once
- 25 you started with a single contractor to initiate the

- 1 work, we're going to burn up more schedule. We're going
- 2 to be at a point where we can't do anything else. And
- 3 we haven't seen any cost data. We haven't seen any
- 4 other options. And based on the fact that we need to do
- 5 it, we need to proceed with or without data.
- 6 So, again, I'm not voting against the
- 7 fact that we need to move ahead immediately, but I'm
- 8 voting against the fact that we're taking a very bad
- 9 process.
- 10 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Commissioner Yao, we
- 11 have a proposed process. I mean I'm open to an
- 12 alternative but I haven't heard one. What alternative
- 13 proposal would you make?
- 14 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: Could I suggest,
- 15 commissioner Yao, I'd like to reserve the last point of
- 16 discussion for the actual consulting with any type of
- 17 agency. So right now it has nothing to do with an
- 18 individual agency. It's simply whether or not we'd like
- 19 to proceed along this line.
- 20 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: I was just going to ask
- 21 before we take a vote should we have public input?
- 22 CHAIRMAN WARD: If we can get through the
- 23 Commission input.
- 24 Once again, I think it's just important
- 25 to wrap all this, summarize. A lot of good debate. The

- 1 overall understanding is that we're trying to vote on a
- 2 concept, a skeleton for what it is the Commission
- 3 envisions on getting our job done. At that point staff
- 4 would like to take that vision, that outline, that
- 5 roadmap that we're trying to create this week, and then
- 6 put faces and contracts and things like that to that
- 7 later. But we need -- we can't go anywhere until we
- 8 agree as a Commission on what we want to do, how we want
- 9 to get the job done, and I think that's the overriding
- 10 principle that we're trying to accomplish today.
- 11 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes. It seems to me
- 12 that what we're doing here is do we want to have
- 13 educational background meetings, nothing more. If the
- 14 answer to that is yes, then we can direct staff to
- 15 discuss with the people who have expressed an interest
- or anybody else and come back, then, at the next
- meeting.
- 18 CHAIRMAN WARD: And I believe that's the
- 19 motion that's on the floor.
- 20 Mr. Claypool?
- 21 MR. CLAYPOOL: I am very sensitive to
- 22 Commissioner Yao's thoughts here, and I think that this
- 23 has all come about because now we're talking about
- 24 moving out of the real m of what was originally proposed,
- 25 which was working through interagency agreements, to

- 1 work with State agencies. So I think what we have to do
- 2 as part of this is we have to come together as a
- 3 Commission and agree that we want to have a structure
- 4 that looks like that.
- 5 And then, as Commissioner DiGuilio I
- 6 think is indicating, when we get to the end where we
- 7 actually talk about the consultant contracts that go
- 8 with this type of an effort, we have to reevaluate how
- 9 we're going to approach having these last -- this last
- 10 piece put into place. If it is a matter of having to go
- 11 through a consultant contract to do it, then we may just
- 12 have to go through the competitive bid process or we may
- 13 have to investigate what other alternatives we have.
- 14 But that I think -- you know, it's
- 15 something that now that we have this concept of going
- 16 beyond, or going outside of the State process and
- 17 Government Code, there's a process in place to do just
- 18 that and we have to investigate it. But that won't in
- 19 any way take away from the structure itself. It only
- 20 addresses how we address each of the pieces within that
- 21 structure. That's all.
- 22 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Yao?
- 23 COMMISSIONER YAO: Let's go forward a few
- 24 weeks, assuming this is February 26. We would have seen
- 25 what the proposed package is. Let's say the package is

- 1 more than we can afford, okay? What options do we have
- 2 on February 26 other than accept it and move forward?
- 3 Because we lost schedule and we can't afford to go
- 4 anywhere else. So that's what I mean by locking
- 5 ourselves into a position where we can't do anything
- 6 el se.
- 7 And by making a decision before -- even
- 8 if I add up the draft data that's here, even if I add up
- 9 the data that's before me, I'm not sure I'm seeing the
- 10 total cost. What's the facility cost for the seven
- 11 meetings? Are there any conflicts between what -- the
- 12 Irvine Foundation and us? Do they have a right to veto
- 13 anything that we want to say? I mean I haven't seen
- 14 anything that convinced me that this really is the only
- option that we have, other than the fact that we're
- 16 running out of time.
- 17 So I think I said all I need to say.
- 18 CHAIRMAN WARD: Again, I think your comments
- 19 are fantastic, Commissioner. They're very fair concerns
- 20 and I think they're concerns we all share. I just think
- 21 what the motion on the floor is asking is simply do we
- 22 want to have training meetings. That's it, as I
- 23 understood the motion stated. All we're trying to agree
- 24 on is that. If we can't agree on that, then where are
- 25 we going to be on February 27th would be the logical

- 1 question.
- 2 COMMISSIONER YAO: I guess I'd like the motion
- 3 restated because that's not what I understood the
- 4 motion.
- 5 CHAIRMAN WARD: Let's do that. Can we have
- 6 the motion on the floor restated, Michelle?
- 7 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: Can you restate it,
- 8 since apparently Commissioner Yao understood better from
- 9 you than from me.
- 10 CHAIRMAN WARD: As I understand the motion on
- 11 the floor, it's motioned that the Commission agree in
- 12 principle to host educational training seminars. Do I
- 13 get a second?
- 14 COMMISSIONER RAYA: That is not what I heard
- 15 the first time.
- 16 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I was focusing simply
- on the educational workshops.
- 18 COMMISSIONER RAYA: And there was an "and"
- 19 after that: And that we would ask our consultants to do
- something.
- 21 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Oh, I'm sorry. I
- 22 guess if we agreed in principle that we would hold the
- 23 educational workshops, that would give the parameters
- 24 for the consultants, then, to give to us a scope of
- work.

- 1 CHAIRMAN WARD: Let me restate my motion. My
- 2 motion is to agree in principle that we as a Commission
- 3 desire to have training workshops. End of motion.
- 4 There's no addition to that as far as moving forward and
- 5 conducting them, as far as agreeing to pay any amount
- 6 for them or anything else, just simply in principle we
- 7 would like to have an educational --
- 8 COMMISSIONER DAI: Point of order. Did
- 9 Commissioner DiGuilio already make a motion?
- 10 CHAIRMAN WARD: That's correct.
- 11 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Do I need to clarify
- 12 it a little more?
- 13 COMMISSIONER RAYA: No, I think I understood
- 14 your motion. If the motion were in fact do we agree to
- 15 have educational workshops, why would anybody have a
- 16 problem with that. And if we do that and then
- 17 subsequently give direction to staff to get proposals,
- 18 scope of work and so on, and costs, I don't have a
- 19 problem with that either.
- 20 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: And that's for
- 21 consideration for the full Commission at the next
- 22 meeting. That's the purpose of this motion.
- 23 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: And I would expand that
- 24 comment that Commissioner Raya just mentioned, that in
- 25 putting the costs together is the cost that includes

- 1 both consultants, Karin and CCP.
- 2 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Again, I'm just saying
- 3 this is where I have a problem. If you're saying this
- 4 is only in concept, great. Nobody can object to that.
- 5 But it's what comes after that that I still have a
- 6 problem with. And I would -- if it's really to approve
- 7 in concept and then subsequently, assuming that motion
- 8 passes, and I'm sure it would, giving direction to
- 9 staff. Because otherwise to me the motion sounds like,
- 10 okay, we've already said these are the consultants;
- 11 these are the people. And that's the concern I have.
- 12 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: It's just the concept
- of the workshops so that we can take that under
- 14 consideration for the next meeting and then we can make
- 15 the decision as to if we go forward.
- 16 CHAIRMAN WARD: Can I make a suggestion.
- 17 Commissioner DiGuilio, would you mind withdrawing your
- 18 motion?
- 19 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Sure.
- 20 CHAIRMAN WARD: And may I ask
- 21 Commissioner Raya to propose a motion.
- 22 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Well, my motion would be
- 23 to approve the concept of educational workshops.
- 24 CHAIRMAN WARD: I second that.
- 25 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Okay. That's it.

- 1 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: That doesn't take us
- 2 where we need to go. We still need to have staff work
- 3 with the numbers to provide that information to us at
- 4 the next meeting. So that motion I disagree with,
- 5 unfortunately.
- 6 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Can we call the
- 7 questi on?
- 8 CHAIRMAN WARD: Pardon?
- 9 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Can we vote on the
- 10 motion?
- 11 CHAIRMAN WARD: Any other panel discussion on
- 12 this motion, motion on the floor, that we have
- 13 educational workshops?
- 14 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: Could I ask for it to
- 15 be amended? Do we want it in concept have it be for
- 16 seven, a number associated with that and not just in
- 17 concept?
- 18 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I have no problem with
- 19 the number.
- 20 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Okay, to amend it just
- 21 to give it an actual number and concept that we would
- 22 have seven educational workshops.
- 23 CHAIRMAN WARD: Is there a second on that?
- She's proposing an amended motion that we
- 25 have educational meeting workshops, and the number of

- 1 seven, that we agree to seven.
- 2 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Second.
- 3 CHAIRMAN WARD: So that motion is seconded and
- 4 is on the table.
- 5 Any other panel discussion before we turn
- 6 it over to public comment?
- 7 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I do have a concern.
- 8 That's a clear motion that we all agree with. It's a
- 9 given that we all agree that we want to have educational
- 10 workshops. I mean it's a motion that really is an
- 11 absolute agreement. It's unanimous, I think. I think
- 12 what's pertinent is that time is running out on us for
- 13 the month of March. I mean it's only two weeks away,
- 14 literally. And to not have staff work with the
- 15 consultants to bring back some set of numbers in terms
- 16 of costs for these seven meetings, I think we're missing
- 17 a very big piece of what we need to accomplish over the
- 18 next two weeks. So I'm not clear if this motion is
- 19 actually putting our efforts into motion so that we'll
- 20 have something concrete at our next meeting.
- 21 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Commissioner Parvenu, I
- 22 would suggest that once this motion passes, as it will,
- 23 that you make a motion to do just that, direct staff to
- 24 do just that. That would be my suggestion.
- 25 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: It takes us back to the

- 1 earlier motion that Commissioner DiGuilio proposed
- 2 earlier which opened this whole discussion.
- 3 CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you for the comment.
- 4 Any other comment from the panel?
- 5 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I move to limit
- 6 debate on this motion.
- 7 CHAIRMAN WARD: At this point I'd like to open
- 8 it up to the public for any public input regarding the
- 9 motion on the floor only. Thank you.
- 10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hi, this is Kathay Feng.
- 11 I'm glad that you're opening this up to public comment.
- 12 I do have some thoughts.
- And I think that time is very short and
- 14 you all are up against not only a hard timeline but also
- 15 a hard resource reality. And if I had to think about
- 16 over the course of the next few months what your main
- 17 focus has to be, the main focus has to be the public
- 18 input phase, and it also has to be the next phase after
- 19 that, which is taking comment as you adjust the maps
- 20 that you're proposed. And so it is hard to say this
- 21 because I think that public education is really
- 22 important, but I do think that one thing you may want to
- 23 consider is, given how limited your time and resources
- 24 are and how hard is it to figure out when and where you
- 25 all can be in the same room for a meeting, that with

- 1 regard to the public input phase you should be focused
- 2 on getting those times and dates nailed down to a "T,"
- 3 not ten-day phases, but to a "T": "I'm going to be in
- 4 this city or this town on these dates."
- 5 And then during this education phase it
- 6 may be useful to think about an alternative to seven
- 7 workshops, which is to create a single video that is
- 8 available online and DVD that organizations can run like
- 9 crazy with and show in many, many more locations than
- 10 seven, that is official, that has maybe a welcome
- 11 message from several of you, that also has the official
- 12 presentation on what the pieces are that people need to
- 13 know, maybe has a navigational tool that allows you to
- 14 jump when you've had enough of a particular section but
- 15 you want to get to another section. I don't think that
- 16 that video needs to be terribly long. We've done long
- 17 workshops for a whole day, but I do believe that a
- 18 workshop in about one to two hours is what you need.
- 19 And a video that runs about that long is about what you
- 20 need, because that's about what people will stand,
- 21 regular folks who are not die-hard, sitting in the
- 22 hearing listening to this all day.
- 23 So I think, just with regard to that, I
- think that a simpler way may be, and it may be useful to
- 25 at least have some apples to compare with whatever other

- 1 fruit you're considering. And I would also suggest that
- 2 there's a number of materials, outreach materials that
- 3 groups have created, that I think many groups would be
- 4 happy to share the content of, that would allow the
- 5 Commission to tweak as you need to but, frankly, crib as
- 6 much as you want to.
- Because I do think that time is of the
- 8 essence and you don't need to recreate a lot of these
- 9 things. For the content of the video, much of that also
- 10 exists, but it may be that you want to create something
- 11 fresh, particularly with your own stamp. That may be a
- 12 way of resolving both the time issues and also, frankly,
- 13 the money issues. And I think that a lot of
- 14 organizations would run with it in a way that gives you
- 15 much broader reach than what you could achieve even with
- 16 seven outreach, and allows the staff to focus on what's
- 17 really important, which is the public input hearings.
- Thank you.
- 19 CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you for your comment.
- 20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Jim Wright. Kathay's got an
- 21 interesting thought there which triggered my thinking.
- 22 What you've been talking about is a nice-to-have. It's
- 23 not a necessary.
- 24 Training the public can be done by a lot
- of other organizations and many organizations that are

- 1 willing to do a lot of that as well, prepare their
- 2 people to give you testimony. Time is running out. The
- 3 thing you need to do and do as quickly as possible is to
- 4 start to gather input from the public, from the
- 5 organizations that want to challenge the current maps,
- 6 are ready to help direct you as to what you should do
- 7 with your maps.
- 8 As I said, this is -- doing a training,
- 9 you sponsoring training of the public is a nice-to-have,
- 10 not a necessary. Let's get on with the rest of the
- 11 task.
- 12 Secondly, if I may offer a criticism to
- 13 the Commission, and that is, please clear your private
- 14 cal endars.
- 15 CHAIRMAN WARD: I'm sorry, sir. We'll have to
- 16 take the rest of that comment in open session. We can
- 17 only take comments about the motion on the floor. And
- 18 yours were excellent. Thank you for your comments.
- 19 AUDI ENCE MEMBER: Thank you.
- 20 CHAIRMAN WARD: Karin, did you have anything
- 21 you wanted to add?
- 22 MS. Mac DONALD: No, thank you.
- 23 CHAIRMAN WARD: Very good. Okay.
- Let's take a vote on the motion on the
- 25 floor. If you're in favor of the motion, raise your

- 1 hand and say "yes." 2 COMMISSION MEMBERS: Yes. 3 CHAIRMAN WARD: All opposed? 4 Any abstentions? 5 COMMISSIONER DAI: I actually vote no. Sorry. 6 I had hoped we would have a chance to discuss it one 7 more time after the public comment. I tend to agree 8 with members of the public. We had talked before about, 9 you know, really leveraging other resources to do the 10 educational pieces. 11 CHAIRMAN WARD: Very good. Would anyone like 12 to reconsider their vote at this time? 13 Any abstentions? 14 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I guess I think it's a 15 point of clarification. My point is to support that we 16 do outreach. It's not in any particular format. If 17 that's not a correct understanding of what the vote was, 18 I apologize. Because I agree. I just want to move on. 19 We agree that we're going to have seven outreach 20 meetings. I think we can decide on the format, whether 21 it's video, whether one person goes, whether -- and I 22 would like to work with our executive director on that 23 But perhaps that wasn't the motion as other pi ece. 24 people understand it.
- 25 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I think the motion

- 1 was actually for educational workshops in seven
- 2 locations, so it's not video; it's not a DVD.
- 3 CHAIRMAN WARD: If I'm correct, the motion was
- 4 put to the floor and voted on at this point. But just
- 5 for the Commission's sake, I'd just like to have it
- 6 restated. The motion was moved that we agree in
- 7 principle to having seven educational workshops.
- 8 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: That the Commission
- 9 conducts?
- 10 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Can I suggest that,
- 11 put out an additional motion that we also, in concept,
- 12 agree to doing educational meetings and a video -- to
- 13 exploring additional formats for educational meetings,
- 14 so that we can have one proposal that comes to us that
- 15 discusses the actual physical seven locations of
- 16 educational meetings and another proposal, if I put
- 17 another motion on for another proposal that would
- 18 include educational workshops in another format other
- 19 than physical meetings? Or is that just confusing the
- 20 issue too much?
- 21 COMMISSIONER FORBES: No, I think that we
- 22 should do that. And I would second that. I was
- 23 actually going to propose that that be considered as a
- 24 part of direction to staff, but I think a motion as a
- 25 separate entity is a good thing, and I'll second that

- 1 motion.
- 2 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: I just want to comment on
- 3 Commissioner Dai's comment. Yes, I think we have a
- 4 number of organizations that we see as partners, and
- 5 they'll be helping us to send out educational materials
- 6 and having their own separate forums. But I think the
- 7 seven educational meetings that this Commission would do
- 8 under this motion would also be a test period for us to
- 9 experiment with the two consultants and how they would
- 10 work together and how they would actually put the plan
- 11 together. So it's a forerunner for phase two and phase
- 12 three.
- 13 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Filkins Webber?
- 14 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Also in response
- to Commissioner Dai's concerns, I see the responsibility
- of an education workshop sponsored, for lack of a better
- 17 word, from this Commission to be very important so that
- 18 the public understands that there is a manner that these
- 19 consultants are suggesting that the public needs to
- 20 present information to this Commission. I don't believe
- 21 that if this Commission relies on private sources
- 22 providing information to the public regarding training
- 23 to the public about how they need to present information
- 24 to us, I don't know -- I know everybody that's out
- 25 there, true, but I don't know what information they're

- 1 providing to the public.
- 2 But at least if we agree to these
- 3 educational workshops that are being proposed and
- 4 offered by this Commission, I feel comfortable that we
- 5 put something together that instructed the public
- 6 regarding the manner in which they would present
- 7 information to us that would be reliable. Because we
- 8 can't go back later and say, Well, we just expected
- 9 Common Cause would get out there and teach the public
- 10 the right way to do it, when in actuality the public
- 11 wasn't properly informed about the manner the
- 12 information should be provided to us.
- Because certainly once we have an
- 14 opportunity to hold the input hearings -- I mean that's
- 15 what everybody is talking about is important -- we need
- 16 to make sure that they come to us appropriately and
- 17 submit the information to us appropriately. So we
- 18 should be charged with the responsibility of educating
- 19 the public so that at a later time, if we need to draw
- these lines and make decisions regarding certain areas,
- 21 if the public didn't provide us the information in the
- 22 manner in which we could use it after we've already
- 23 instructed and provided education to them about how we
- 24 need to be informed, we need to do it to the best of our
- 25 ability. And so I think we are charged with the

- 1 responsibility to advise the public regarding the manner
- 2 in which this information should be presented to us.
- 3 CHAIRMAN WARD: So we're going to go ahead.
- 4 We have a motion on the floor. Fantastic comments
- 5 regarding a decision that's been made and moved past at
- 6 this point. So let's go ahead and have a restating of
- 7 the motion that's on the floor and move forward.
- 8 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I'd like to make a
- 9 motion that we also consider other formats for
- 10 educational meetings, such as video, online postings, so
- 11 that -- I'd like to consider options for other formats
- 12 for educational meetings. Is that enough?
- 13 CHAIRMAN WARD: May we just direct staff to do
- 14 that?
- 15 COMMISSIONER FORBES: -- (i naudi bl e) --
- 16 CHAIRMAN WARD: So we have a second on that
- 17 motion. Very good.
- 18 Any further discussion from the panel?
- 19 Commi ssi oner Yao?
- 20 COMMISSIONER YAO: Question. Does this
- 21 involve committing any amount of money to pursue the
- 22 output that we're expecting the next time we meet?
- 23 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: My motion was simply
- 24 to be able to provide parameters for any consultants
- 25 to -- if we would like to know what the cost of this is

- 1 we have to be able to tell them, "The Commission would
- 2 like you -- we'd like to task you with giving us the
- 3 money, the budgetary requirements for doing..." whether
- 4 it be the seven educational meetings or the actual other
- 5 formats for educational meetings.
- 6 COMMISSIONER DAI: For example, this might be
- 7 a how-to video on the website, which I think would get
- 8 far wider distribution than seven locations.
- 9 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: So this motion would
- 10 be simply agreeing that we would like to look into that
- 11 as an option and we would like to get feedback from
- 12 consultants as to what those elements would be and what
- 13 the cost associated for -- for other formats of
- 14 educational meetings.
- 15 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Ontai?
- 16 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: So the answer to the
- 17 question is no.
- 18 CHAIRMAN WARD: Correct.
- 19 Okay. So we had a motion and second to
- 20 pursue a motion that we will look into other and all
- 21 media vehicles by which to conduct these training
- 22 sessions. Is that an accurate restatement of your
- 23 motion?
- 24 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Yes.
- 25 CHAIRMAN WARD: And it's been seconded.

- 1 Mr. Claypool has a comment.
- 2 MR. CLAYPOOL: I just have a question, not a
- 3 comment. So my question is, I heard staff will look
- 4 into this, okay? Am I correct or incorrect?
- 5 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: I think that it's --
- 6 we're going to try to have staff work with consultants,
- 7 task consultants to provide the scope of work for us.
- 8 There's two options for educational meetings that we
- 9 proposed. One are the physical meetings and one are the
- 10 other options. So it would be staff to work with
- 11 consultants to give us that scope of work.
- 12 MR. CLAYPOOL: And the only clarification I
- 13 would ask is, would we then work through the technical
- 14 committee before we come back? I just want to make sure
- 15 that we know the route we're supposed to take with this
- 16 information. Because I know -- so we would work through
- 17 the technical committee. Am I correct?
- 18 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: I think there's a
- 19 junction between technical and outreach, but let's be
- 20 the point person for now.
- 21 MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay.
- 22 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Thank you also for that
- 23 clarification. I needed to hear that.
- 24 CHAIRMAN WARD: At this point I'd like to open
- 25 the microphone to the public who might have any comments

- 1 directly related to the issue of exploring other
- 2 vehicles and all vehicles for conducting training
- 3 workshops.
- 4 Seeing no one moving to the microphone,
- 5 I'd like to take a vote on this motion. If you're in
- 6 favor, raise your hand and say "yes."
- 7 COMMISSION MEMBERS: Yes.
- 8 CHAIRMAN WARD: All opposed?
- 9 Any abstentions?
- 10 And so moved.
- 11 COMMISSIONER YAO: Chair Ward?
- 12 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: Congratulations,
- 13 everyone, on getting these educational workshops under
- 14 our belt. Now let's move on --
- 15 CHAIRMAN WARD: I think the Commissioner has a
- 16 point of order.
- 17 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Oh, I'm sorry.
- 18 COMMISSIONER YAO: Let me try to make another
- 19 motion which I think will push our cause a little
- 20 further than what the first two motions that we did. I
- 21 think if we simply come back in February and start
- 22 looking at proposals, we would have slipped our schedule
- 23 even further. But I still have concern about approving
- something that we don't have complete data on.
- 25 So the motion I'm about to make is to

- 1 approve an expenditure not to exceed let's say \$100,000
- 2 so that we can have a package that's a training package,
- 3 whether we do it ourselves or whether we go out and
- 4 solicit partners to deliver the training package and
- 5 stay on the training schedule that's been previously
- 6 approved, okay.
- 7 The difference between what I just
- 8 proposed and the very initial proposal was that the very
- 9 initial proposal, I couldn't see a maximum number to the
- 10 expenditure because no one is willing to commit to any
- 11 number. But the proposal I'm making is that at least
- 12 there's a cap on it, and I know that we're not going to
- 13 exceed it. And I think that will give the subcommittee
- 14 and staff and anybody that's interested in making
- 15 progress with the training the flexibility to move
- 16 forward at the pace that we want to move. So that's the
- 17 motion I'm putting before the group.
- 18 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: Can I suggest, because
- 19 I do think this is an important issue Commissioner Yao
- 20 is raising, but I think our legal counsel has something
- 21 to say about contracts and how we can do those and the
- 22 limitations and the monetary and the structure. So can
- 23 I propose that we postpone that and have Mr. Miller
- 24 discuss that after we get one more item of business
- 25 regarding the technical committee under our belt? Would

- 1 you feel comfortable with that, Commissioner Yao?
- 2 CHAIRMAN WARD: I'd like to, as Chair, just
- 3 see if there's even a second that we need to table that
- 4 for. Is there a second for Commissioner Yao's motion?
- Not hearing any second at this time,
- 6 we'll move forward with the subcommittee agenda.
- 7 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Okay, again, I'd like
- 8 to just move on to the public input hearings, and in a
- 9 similar manner I think I'm going to ask for two things
- 10 to be considered by this Commission, and maybe more
- 11 based on our discussion. But what it would be, again,
- 12 is in a conceptual basis if -- we have to have an
- 13 agreement on how we'd like to move forward so again we
- 14 can ask our consultants to come forward with an actual
- 15 hard schedule for these public input hearings.
- So in order to give them, whoever the
- 17 consultant may be, in order to give them the parameters,
- 18 I'd like the Commission first to discuss -- excuse me,
- 19 let me back up.
- 20 As I understand it, our intention is to
- 21 try and have at least three commissioners at a meeting,
- 22 at a public input hearing, with the option of getting as
- 23 many as possible that can actually attend. The next
- 24 question is if the Commission agrees on the concept of
- 25 the nine regions and having at least one meeting for

- 1 each phase within those nine regions, if we could at
- 2 least have an idea of the number of meetings we'd like
- 3 to start off with so we can have a hard schedule
- 4 presented to us, I think, as the public input has
- 5 suggested, we need to actually have some meetings down
- 6 on paper that we can look at and say, yes, we agree to,
- 7 no, we want more or less. But we have to start
- 8 someplace.
- 9 Can I ask the Commission to consider if
- 10 we do three -- excuse me, one meeting for each phase in
- 11 a region, that gives us 27 meetings. If we'd like to
- 12 bump it up to at least four meetings per region, we're
- 13 at 36, and so on. So would the commissioners like to
- 14 discuss a potential number to look at for public input
- 15 heari ngs?
- 16 CHAIRMAN WARD: I thought I'd jump in first
- 17 this time. The only thing, as I was trying to review
- 18 this and understand, not having not been in on the
- 19 subcommittee meeting, so perhaps this was addressed
- 20 there, but I'm not entirely sure -- I guess I was
- 21 expecting the technical committee to come forward and
- 22 present to us that regional approach and help us
- 23 understand how that was created and why that's the best,
- 24 nine-region approach is the best way to tackle this.
- 25 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And I may have Karin

- 1 address that since it was part of the methodology that
- 2 was in there. I think part of it was to try to get a
- 3 handle on a regional approach from which within that
- 4 region we can move around to make sure we try to get the
- 5 geographic diversity. But I'll have Karin discuss that.
- 6 MS. Mac DONALD: Right. Well, there are two
- 7 ways of going about this. One, I could bring back the
- 8 presentation that I gave yesterday, the PowerPoint. You
- 9 actually have it. I don't know if you can -- or I can
- 10 just walk you through it. You have all the supporting
- 11 documents, basically.
- 12 CHAIRMAN WARD: May I ask is this presentation
- 13 available or going to be available for the public view?
- 14 I'm concerned that the public understand, if we were
- 15 take a vote on the nine-region concept and all that, I
- 16 want to make sure everybody understands, including
- myself, why we chose a nine-region concept.
- 18 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I'm sorry,
- 19 Chairman Ward, this was discussed in the subcommittee
- 20 meeting yesterday fully, and it was a public hearing.
- 21 CHAIRMAN WARD: Very good.
- 22 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I'm not certain
- 23 why we would be asking Ms. Mac Donald to go through. I
- 24 did sit in for a brief period of time and I understand
- 25 where these concepts come from, but I don't know if it's

- 1 an efficient use of this full Commission's time for
- 2 something that she's fully completely presented to the
- 3 public yesterday in a subcommittee.
- I certainly appreciate your question.
- 5 know how she got to the nine because I sat in on it, but
- 6 I thought the idea was to accept reporting from
- 7 subcommittees rather than having them reiterate
- 8 everything that was already presented by a consultant
- 9 expert that spoke at a subcommittee meeting.
- 10 CHAIRMAN WARD: I think that's a great point
- 11 and I thank you for raising it,
- 12 Commissioner Filkins Webber. However, we have to vote
- 13 on that, and I think that it's a fair question to ask,
- 14 to have just at least a basic understanding of what data
- 15 drives to make that decision. If I was asked why did I
- 16 vote for a nine-region concept as opposed to a
- 17 ten-region concept, I could not answer that question.
- 18 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: Can I suggest that for
- 19 the sake of getting the ball started that we consider
- 20 nine. We're not locking ourselves into nine. But if we
- 21 start with nine as an overarching for regions and any
- 22 consultants came back to us with a proposal of schedule
- 23 of meetings based on these nine regions and we took a
- 24 look at it and said, "You know what, we're really
- 25 missing this over here; let's add an extra region." But

- 1 I think we have to start somewhere, so the point was to
- 2 start with nine.
- 3 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Dai?
- 4 COMMISSIONER DAI: Ms. Mac Donald, could you
- 5 in one minute tell us why there are nine regions?
- 6 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Even up to five
- 7 minutes, I think we could agree.
- 8 MS. Mac DONALD: Okay. Well, I can summarize
- 9 it really quickly. The handout that I passed out
- 10 earlier, let me just walk you through it. So first
- 11 there's this document that says Draft 2-10-11, so that's
- 12 basically the document that describes both approaches.
- 13 One is the approach to locate the educational background
- 14 meetings and where they might go, and that's basically
- 15 the methodology that we use to, again, locate the
- 16 redistricting assistance sites for the Irvine centers,
- 17 or the Irvine-funded centers. That methodology is in
- 18 Appendix 1, and the map that refers to it is Appendix 2.
- 19 Now the question is nine regions. Now,
- 20 that is a different methodology, so now I would refer
- 21 you to Appendix 3 and the map that is entitled
- 22 Appendix 4. So what I'm going to summarize right now is
- 23 Appendix 3 very quickly, and it is really described in
- 24 the first document. Again, that's entitled Draft
- 25 2-10-11.

- For these inputs hearings, as I entitled
 them in this particular document, we tried to come up
- 3 with a methodology that would incorporate your desire,
- 4 the Commission's desire to reach populations that had
- 5 previously not necessarily been engaged in the
- 6 redistricting process. And you recall this came out of
- 7 the idea of perhaps doing 50 meetings out in areas in
- 8 California, and then, you know, one of the locations
- 9 that was specifically outlined was I think Susanville
- 10 and then also Eureka. And we also considered some
- 11 geographic regions and commonalties in just organizing
- 12 these regions.
- So these regions are really organizing
- 14 units. And to go one step further, these regions can,
- 15 further on, or later on also be used to organize
- 16 line-drawing activities. So I really took a bit of a
- 17 comprehensive approach here to save some time and money,
- 18 because both are short.
- 19 So really you shouldn't look at these in
- 20 terms of set in stone. Really look at them as
- 21 organizing units. You can look at the most northern
- 22 region, which is region 8, I believe, or region 9.
- 23 Yeah, region 9. And then you could envision perhaps
- 24 holding your first public input hearing maybe up in
- 25 Eureka, because that's where some of you would like to

- 1 go, and have that first one there.
- 2 But then the next time you go back go
- 3 someplace else in that particular region. And perhaps,
- 4 if we go back the second time, we will already have some
- 5 census data so we know where the lines are going to
- 6 fall. So then there's going to be an interaction with
- 7 you because many of you know these areas very well and
- 8 the suggestion of where the specific hearing location
- 9 should be. And then that should go to the outreach
- 10 consultants. They will find us a spot to actually do
- 11 that. And then we collect input.
- So that's really how we were thinking
- 13 about this particular approach. So don't -- I'm not
- 14 suggesting that these are communities of interest, that
- there's anything else other than it's an organizing
- 16 unit. It makes a lot of sense. We have to start
- 17 someplace. It gives us flexibility and it enables you
- 18 to do what you stated to me you wanted to do. And
- 19 everything in detail is in these appendices.
- 20 And I think that's about -- if you have
- 21 questions, then I'll go into those.
- 22 CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you, Karin. That was
- 23 very helpful.
- 24 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I don't have a question.
- 25 I just have a comment. I think that as long as we can

- 1 move around the meetings, and that's at this point the
- 2 concept, that I think going with the nine regions at
- 3 this point is a useful thing. Because I do think we
- 4 have to move down the field. So I would be comfortable
- 5 that we direct staff to come up with a hard schedule of
- 6 meeting this plan.
- 7 Perhaps the location may be more
- 8 difficult, but in terms of we're going to be in district
- 9 3 on these dates. And then we'll leave it where that
- 10 might be for a later date. I think the hard schedule
- 11 for all of us, the sooner we know, the better chance we
- 12 have of being able to make more meetings rather than
- 13 fewer.
- 14 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner DiGuilio?
- 15 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And just the
- 16 logistics, we wouldn't be tasking staff to do it. We
- 17 would be tasking consultants. Just the logistics,
- 18 because I see staff over there going...
- 19 CHAI RMAN WARD: Conni e?
- 20 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I would
- 21 actually be interested in seeing both the 27-meeting and
- 22 the 36-meeting approach. That's something that I think
- 23 is easily asked for the consultants to prepare a couple
- 24 options for us.
- 25 MS. Mac DONALD: May I add to that I was

- 1 actually also suggesting that you schedule one hearing
- 2 in addition for statewide groups. I don't know if you
- 3 want to do that in Sacramento or where, but that could
- 4 also be scheduled. I think it's really important to
- 5 schedule at least one or two of these hearings in each
- 6 region well in advance so that the public can prepare to
- 7 actually see you at that point and have their testimony
- 8 ready for you.
- 9 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Would it be useful to
- 10 plan two, one in Northern California and one in
- 11 Southern, for the statewide groups?
- MS. Mac DONALD: The statewide? Well, if you
- 13 think about, the way I am right now, and if you don't
- 14 want to add too many hearings, then I would say do one
- in each phase at a minimum, and then you could of course
- 16 also -- you know, since, then, California is your
- 17 region, then you can also jump around.
- 18 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: So building off
- 19 of that piece of feedback, I'd like to redirect
- 20 commissioners to the agenda that was posted which is our
- 21 agenda for our February 23rd through 27th meeting in
- 22 Sacramento. I think it was given to you late this
- 23 morning. If you turn to the back page, anticipating
- 24 that this might be a direction that we'd want to take as
- 25 a Commission, I went ahead and took the liberty, working

- 1 with Vice Commissioner Filkins Webber for that meeting,
- 2 to actually post an opportunity to do a Commission
- 3 session to receive information on efforts to educate the
- 4 public on redistricting.
- Now, the thinking behind this would be
- 6 that this would be an opportunity for us to go ahead and
- 7 get started on one of these listening sessions; and that
- 8 we will already be in Sacramento. We have an excellent
- 9 space that's being provided to us there by the
- 10 legislature. The objective of the session would be to
- 11 give commissioners a general understanding of the
- 12 redistricting education and outreach done by
- 13 citizen-based organizations and groups statewide and the
- 14 plans for those entities for additional outreach in the
- 15 future.
- The goal of the session would not be to
- 17 receive formal communities-of-interest testimony. Those
- 18 are currently being scheduled, of course, as we've just
- 19 directed staff or consultants to work on various
- 20 proposals, and will be held across the state.
- 21 With the posting of the agenda, groups
- 22 and organizations are invited to give presentations to
- the Commission, and this would offer two opportunities.
- 24 One would be that groups who have a statewide interest
- in redistricting could schedule to make a presentation

- 1 to the Commission as a group on behalf of a larger
- 2 number of community members. And we would also provide
- 3 the opportunity for individuals who are interested who
- 4 have statewide feedback and perspectives to weigh in.
- 5 So this is a place holder. This is an
- 6 option that's there. We do have the facilities there.
- 7 We do have working relationships now with consultants
- 8 who could actually help us pull this off. But I wanted
- 9 to put it on the table so that when we come out of
- 10 session here we're able to have a firm decision on
- 11 whether we're going to move forward with this particular
- 12 outreach meeting on February 26th.
- 13 CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you for pointing that
- 14 out, Vice Chair. Why don't we consider that as a
- 15 Commission and revisit it when we discuss scheduling and
- 16 calendaring towards the close of business tomorrow and
- 17 we can further define and make that happen.
- 18 Commissioner DiGuilio?
- 19 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I was curious as to
- 20 whether there was other discussion. Otherwise I would
- 21 present a motion to say that we would like to have both
- 22 at least the 27 and the 36 format, number of meetings
- 23 for the public input hearing to be -- let me rephrase
- 24 this.
- 25 I'd like to have a motion that we ask

- 1 consultants to present options for both the 27 and 36
- 2 meetings, plus I would say -- was it a recommendation
- 3 for three? -- at least three statewide meetings.
- 4 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Second.
- 5 COMMISSIONER DAI: Point of order. We already
- 6 have a motion on the floor about the nine-region
- 7 approach.
- 8 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I'll second that motion.
- 9 That hadn't gotten a second yet, had it?
- 10 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes.
- 11 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Oh, it was seconded?
- 12 CHAIRMAN WARD: We were just looking for a
- 13 restating of the motion.
- 14 COMMISSIONER DAI: Did we get a second,
- 15 Janeece?
- 16 MS. SARGIS: I didn't hear one.
- 17 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I second
- 18 Commissioner Forbes's motion.
- 19 COMMISSIONER DAI: It was
- 20 Commissioner DiGuilio's motion.
- 21 CHAIRMAN WARD: There's a motion on the floor
- 22 and it's been seconded by both Commissioner Blanco and
- 23 Commissioner Forbes, and I'm asking is there any further
- 24 panel debate?
- 25 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Which motion are we -- I

- 1 understood that there was one. There was a motion made
- 2 by Commissioner DiGuilio to go with nine regions. I
- 3 don't know if there was a second to that.
- 4 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: I'm sorry, I got ahead
- 5 of myself. So I'd like to go back to the original
- 6 for -- a motion for the nine-region approach for the
- 7 public input hearings.
- 8 CHAIRMAN WARD: Let's go ahead, for complete
- 9 clarity's sake -- and I see Janeece with her hand up.
- 10 Let's go ahead and have a statement of exactly what the
- 11 motion is right now, and we'll confirm the seconds, and
- 12 then we're going to vote on this.
- 13 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Okay, the motion is to
- 14 approve in concept the nine-region approach for the
- 15 public input hearings.
- 16 CHAIRMAN WARD: Okay. That was your second,
- 17 correct, Commissioner Blanco?
- 18 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: -- (i naudi bl e) --
- 19 CHAIRMAN WARD: Okay. Any further panel
- 20 debate on that. Commissioner?
- 21 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Well, I can either
- 22 offer a friendly amendment, which is to add the other
- 23 suggested motion, or we can do a separate motion, which
- is to include the statewide input hearings as well,
- 25 which I think is not in your original motion. So I'd

- 1 offer that as a friendly amendment.
- 2 CHAIRMAN WARD: The amendment is noted. Could
- 3 you please state that amendment?
- 4 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I propose that the
- 5 motion be amended to include language that at least one
- 6 statewide hearing be conducted by the Commission.
- 7 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: I think actually that
- 8 was a part of the second motion that I made, which was
- 9 the 27 versus 36.
- 10 So my first motion was simply to approve
- 11 the nine regions.
- 12 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Okay. Whatever gets it
- 13 on --
- 14 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: And the second motion
- 15 was to -- yeah, let's stay there.
- 16 CHAIRMAN WARD: So is there a second to that
- 17 amendment?
- Not seeing any second --
- 19 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: It was an
- amendment to the motion, and that's why I would second.
- 21 CHAIRMAN WARD: So we have a second to the
- 22 amended motion that we're going to approach a
- 23 nine-region concept for public outreach and --
- 24 Was it one or at least one?
- 25 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: At Least one.

- 1 CHAIRMAN WARD: -- (continuing) at least one 2 statewide meeting.
- Any further panel discussion on this motion? Okay.
- 5 COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Ancheta, do
- 6 you want to clarify this was for statewide groups, as
- 7 was suggested by Ms. Mac Donald. Or what did you mean
- 8 by "one additional public input meeting," since they're
- 9 all input meetings.
- 10 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Okay, let me clarify
- 11 that. And I will rely -- maybe more specifically that
- 12 there be at least one input hearing scheduled during
- 13 each phase specifically focused on statewide issues that
- 14 are not specific to any one region.
- 15 CHAIRMAN WARD: So noted. Any other panel
- 16 di scussi on?
- 17 Okay, at this point we'll go ahead and
- 18 open the microphone for public comment on strictly the
- 19 motion on the floor of a nine-region approach to public
- 20 outreach and at least one statewide outreach meeting.
- 21 Si r?
- 22 AUDI ENCE MEMBER: Good afternoon. I'm Bruce
- 23 Campbell. This nine-region approach doesn't acknowledge
- 24 the distinct community of interest on the north coast
- and the physiographic province and all. And also

- 1 Mr. Ontai's handout had north coastal as one of six
- 2 districts, and all of a sudden region 9 is massive. And
- 3 are we to sort of assume that there will a somewhat
- 4 similar number of hearings in tiny Orange County as in
- 5 this massive region 9? So I don't care for it.
- 6 CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you for your comment.
- 7 AUDI ENCE MEMBER: Doug Johnson from the
- 8 Rose Institute. If I may just ask a clarifying question
- 9 on the statewide issues forum. And I think I know where
- 10 the Commission is, but I just wanted to get it for the
- 11 public. Is the goal that if someone wants to talk at
- 12 that hearing about a local regional issue the Commission
- 13 won't hear it, or are you just trying to say that that
- 14 will be the focus of that hearing?
- 15 Thank you.
- 16 CHAIRMAN WARD: We'll let the subcommittee
- 17 clarify that after we're done with public comment.
- 18 Any further public comment on this issue?
- 19 No one else approaching the microphone,
- 20 we'll close that.
- 21 And would the subcommittee like to
- 22 clarify what the statewide meeting might entail or
- 23 excl ude?
- 24 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Do we need to discuss
- 25 that now?

1	CHAIRMAN WARD: I just wanted you to make a
2	clarifying statement.
3	COMMISSIONER DiGUILLO: Oh, okay.
4	CHAIRMAN WARD: As I understood, the statewide
5	meeting is open to anyone. It was just an invitation
6	for statewide groups.
7	COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: That would be the
8	primary focus, but it wouldn't be at the exclusion of
9	other groups.
10	CHAIRMAN WARD: Excellent.
11	Anymore panel discussion on this matter?
12	Okay, let's take a vote. All in favor raise your hand
13	and say "yes," please.
14	COMMISSION MEMBERS: Yes.
15	CHAIRMAN WARD: All opposed?
16	Any abstentions?
17	Okay, the motion is passed.
18	Commissioner DiGuilio?
19	COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: The only other thing
20	would be the second part of that motion which we were
21	discussing earlier is, again, to give the parameters and
22	concept for 27 and 36 type of structure for public input
23	hearings, that again we can go forward with actually
24	having an outline, a schedule of meetings based on 27 or
25	36 public input hearings for our review at a later date.

- 1 COMMISSIONER DAI: I'm sorry to be a stickler
- 2 on this, but I think there's a point of order, because
- 3 Commissioner Ancheta actually made an amendment, so we
- 4 were voting on the amendment. So we need to vote on the
- 5 full motion now.
- 6 CHAIRMAN WARD: Can I have a restatement of
- 7 the motion on the floor?
- 8 COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Ancheta, your
- 9 amendment?
- 10 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: -- (i naudi bl e) --
- 11 CHAIRMAN WARD: No, we passed the amended
- 12 motion.
- 13 COMMISSIONER DAI: We're back to the original
- 14 motion now.
- 15 CHAIRMAN WARD: We're back to the original
- 16 motion.
- 17 COMMISSIONER DAI: So would you like to state
- 18 the full motion with Commissioner Ancheta's motion just
- 19 to be clear.
- 20 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: And we're talking
- 21 about the nine regions?
- 22 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes.
- 23 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: That we approve a nine
- 24 regional approach for the public input hearings with the
- amendment to include statewide meetings.

- 1 CHAIRMAN WARD: That was voted on and passed.
- 2 I think there's an original motion that's still on the
- 3 floor that you can feel free to withdraw.
- 4 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: Okay, the original one
- 5 was just simply the nine regions.
- 6 CHAIRMAN WARD: That was seconded.
- 7 COMMISSIONER DIGUILLO: Sorry.
- 8 CHAIRMAN WARD: Okay. Would you like to vote
- 9 or withdraw on that motion?
- 10 COMMISSIONER DAI: We have to vote on it.
- 11 CHAIRMAN WARD: We have to vote on it.
- 12 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes. Just, Chair --
- 13 CHAIRMAN WARD: The way I understood it is we
- 14 didn't just vote on the amendment, though. When we
- 15 stated the motion that we were voting on we wrapped it
- 16 all into one. So perhaps that was my error, but it's
- 17 already passed so I don't think we need to revote
- 18 because I made an error and didn't separate out the
- 19 amendment first. I don't believe that we need to go
- 20 ahead --
- 21 COMMISSIONER DAI: Well, I actually think we
- 22 do.
- 23 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I think procedurally we
- 24 voted on the motion for the amendment and that got added
- 25 to the original motion, so now we have the original

- 1 motion with the amendment on the table.
- 2 COMMISSIONER DAI: We do have to vote on it.
- 3 CHAIRMAN WARD: Could you restate the motion
- 4 for us, please, Commissioner Dai?
- 5 COMMISSIONER DAI: As I understand it, the
- 6 motion was to vote on the concept of a nine-region
- 7 approach and to add -- and we only voted on the
- 8 amendment, which was to add a statewide issues meeting
- 9 in each of the regions. That's what we voted on.
- 10 CHAIRMAN WARD: May I ask staff, Janeece, what
- 11 did you record as our vote?
- MS. SARGIS: My understanding was that the
- amended motion was wrapped into the original motion and
- 14 that that was voted on and passed.
- 15 CHAIRMAN WARD: As stated I think three times,
- 16 right?
- 17 MS. SARGIS: Yes.
- 18 COMMISSIONER DAI: Right. We can't just wrap
- 19 it, though. You have to formally amend a motion. So we
- 20 voted on the amendment, and that was to add the
- 21 statewide meeting in each one. Now we're back to the
- 22 original motion which has now been amended.
- 23 CHAIRMAN WARD: I second it.
- 24 Any further comment on this motion?
- Okay, I'd like to open it up to the

- 1 public at this time.
- 2 AUDI ENCE MEMBER: I might suggest to the
- 3 Commission that when you have confusion about what the
- 4 motion on the floor is perhaps the reporter can read
- 5 back the original motion rather than all the
- 6 machinations you've just gone through.
- 7 In the discussion of the motion there was
- 8 also the issue raised of whether you're going to have 27
- 9 or 36 or 48 possible sessions, and I don't think that
- 10 was addressed in subsequent discussion, although I think
- 11 it was part of the original motion which should be in
- 12 the record. And as to that issue of 27 or 36 or 48, an
- 13 earlier public comment talked about the gigantic
- 14 region 9, and I would add region 6 and the northern half
- 15 of region 2.
- 16 For some of these huge geographic areas
- 17 you may not want to tie yourself to a particular number
- 18 of sessions in those regions. I'm guessing that
- 19 region 9 could easily call for four or more sessions
- 20 simply because of the huge geographic area and the
- 21 geographic separation with mountains from coastal and so
- 22 forth and so on.
- So I don't know where you want to take it
- 24 from there, but I think you perhaps need to have a basis
- 25 to go back and recall what the original motion was,

- 1 because the motion seemed to be restated differently
- 2 each time that you asked for a recap.
- 3 CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you for your comments.
- 4 I appreciate that.
- 5 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: Maybe I could clarify.
- 6 I think we had this confusion so we went back and simply
- 7 started a nine-region approach to try and get that.
- 8 That was the motion for nine regions, and hence the
- 9 amendment for that. And then we were going to return
- 10 back to the actual number once we were finished with
- 11 this conversation.
- 12 CHAIRMAN WARD: We have another comment?
- 13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I wonder if it's possible
- 14 to -- like the term "several," doesn't that mean like
- 15 two to somewhere around six or seven. So it seems like
- 16 that would encompass and wouldn't be tied to a certain
- 17 number in various regions. I like to be specific but
- 18 that's sort of vague, yet encompassing.
- 19 CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you for your comment.
- 20 At this time, seeing no one else
- 21 approaching the microphone, I would like to put this
- 22 motion to vote. All in favor of the motion on the
- 23 floor, please raise your hand and say "yes."
- 24 COMMISSION MEMBERS: Yes.
- 25 CHAIRMAN WARD: All opposed.

1	Any abstention?
2	And the motion is moved.
3	COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Mr. Chair, let me just
4	make a comment at this time, and that is that I think
5	you're doing a great job in herding cats. And I would
6	ask the public to be patient with us because, yes, it
7	gets awkward at times, but I think as a Commission we're
8	committed to the mission, and if it means that we extend
9	our day into the evening to make sure that we take care
10	of the business, that's what we do. But ultimately
11	we're trying to lay the brick foundation for a very
12	solid process in the future. It's all about serving the
13	public.
14	So I was watching you and thinking, "Take
15	a deep breath, brother." Because sitting in that chair
16	is not an easy thing to do, and I appreciate your work.
17	CHAIRMAN WARD: No problem at all. The debate
18	is fantastic and well needed, you're right.
19	Commissioner DiGuilio?
20	COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: I think just lastly,
21	the one last thing as I understand would be helpful, in
22	terms of getting some parameters again for the
23	consultants to work with, would be addressing the
24	number, a starting point for the number of public input
25	hearings. And so I would like to, if the commissioners

- 1 have any feedback in regards to 27 versus 36 or if we
- 2 should just move to a motion to look at -- as to those
- 3 two starting points.
- 4 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Ontai?
- 5 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: I was just going to echo
- 6 the comments made by Commissioner Aguirre, that the
- 7 viewing public be very patient with us. It's been a
- 8 long night, and as I'm listening to
- 9 Commissioner DiGuilio I just want to share this, that --
- 10 with my fellow commissioners, that she was up until 3:00
- o'clock this morning putting these notes together. So
- 12 bear with her.
- 13 COMMISSIONER FORBES: She asked for a comment
- 14 on the 27 versus the 36. I think the initial idea was
- 15 to try to come up with a schedule for both. And just in
- 16 my opinion, that for the sake of the public, concern
- 17 about some of these larger regions, that does not
- 18 preclude us from down the road adding. But for the
- 19 purposes of asking our staff to work over the next two
- 20 weeks with the consultants, that I would support the 27
- 21 or 36 as alternates.
- 22 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I just have one
- 23 question, and you certainly may have addressed this. As
- 24 I understand it, you're talking about one meeting per
- 25 phase, three meetings per region. That gets you to the

- 1 27. What's the additional fourth meeting for in these
- 2 regions?
- COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think it was just
- 4 the understanding that particularly as we get into the
- 5 nitty-gritty that there may be a need for at least going
- 6 back twice in phase two. So that gives you an option of
- 7 four meetings. So it's just building anticipation that
- 8 at the bare minimum we've asked to go in three times,
- 9 but let's look at an option that gives us four, and
- 10 knowing -- I think if we try to provide a condensed
- 11 schedule, then maybe we can have options to add more
- 12 later on.
- 13 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: So it's not just
- 14 a particular region, a special region meeting, that
- 15 fourth one. It's just the possibility of still
- 16 accepting further input because you would find that you
- 17 needed it. It's not a special fourth meeting.
- 18 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Correct.
- 19 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Thank you.
- 20 MS. Mac DONALD: Yes, if I may, it's really
- 21 just designed to give you some flexibility. Because
- 22 once we know which way the lines are going to be moving
- 23 you may see the need to hold five or so, or six even,
- 24 hearings in some of these organizing units, but in
- others you may just have to hold one because there's not

- 1 that much public input and the issues are pretty clear
- 2 and the public is ectatic about the lines you're going
- 3 to be proposing. It does happen.
- 4 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
- 5 Ward, I have a clarification as well, which is in
- 6 regards to the statewide input hearings. So if we were
- 7 to that say we're going to see a proposal with 27
- 8 meetings as one approach, it would actually be 27 plus
- 9 three?
- 10 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: Correct. I'm sorry,
- 11 yes. Those would be for the baseline for the regional
- 12 approach ones, and I would like to add that there would
- 13 be at least three more meetings for the state, at the
- 14 statewide level for each phase.
- 15 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you.
- 16 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I guess I'm not sure how
- 17 to do this in terms of planning dates, which is what
- 18 people want to start doing, but I'm a little concerned
- 19 with locking us into 36 as a cap.
- 20 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: I'm sorry, that would
- 21 be the starting point.
- 22 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I just want to clarify
- 23 that, because I think it's possible that one region will
- 24 need a lot, to go back twice or -- you know. So I want
- 25 to just clarify that it's not a cap.

- 1 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: It's the bottom.
 2 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I suggest a bio
- 3 break.
- 4 CHAIRMAN WARD: Absolutely. Let's keep it to
- 5 five minutes and we'll re-adjourn in five minutes.
- 6 (Recess from 3: 37 p.m. to 3: 52 p.m.)
- 7 CHAIRMAN WARD: Okay, let's go ahead and get
- 8 back in session. We missed five minutes by a few
- 9 seconds, but we're back. We're going to go ahead and go
- 10 back to Commissioner DiGuilio and pick up where we left
- 11 off.
- 12 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: Commissioner Ward was
- 13 trying to remind me. I think we were in the discussion
- 14 phase of setting the minimum number of public input
- 15 hearings at 27, at least having the minimum number being
- 16 set at 27, having a schedule for 27 and 36, knowing that
- 17 we can build on that later. Is that where we left off?
- 18 Did we have a motion on that?
- 19 CHAIRMAN WARD: We had a motion on that. Do
- 20 we have a second?
- 21 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes, second.
- 22 CHAIRMAN WARD: Second, we do. Okay.
- 23 Anything from the panel before we open it
- 24 to the public?
- 25 At this point I'd like to open the

- 1 microphone to the public for specific comments on the
- 2 motion at hand.
- 3 Seeing no one approaching the microphone,
- 4 let's go ahead and take the vote. All in favor raise
- 5 your hand and say "yes."
- 6 COMMISSION MEMBERS: Yes.
- 7 CHAIRMAN WARD: All opposed.
- 8 Any abstentions?
- 9 Okay, so moved.
- Thank you, Commissioner DiGuilio.
- 11 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: At this point I'd like
- 12 to -- again, the discussion has been made about -- we've
- 13 been referring to consultants in the abstract, and I'd
- 14 like to turn this over to maybe Mr. Claypool and
- 15 Mr. Miller who may have some comments about the actual
- 16 consulting of these services that we've provided.
- 17 And before we move on to that I'd just
- 18 like to say a big thank you to all my fellow
- 19 commissioners. I know we slogged through a lot of this,
- 20 and I appreciate all the paperwork that you've just been
- 21 handed, and good luck in organizing it. But I
- 22 appreciate all our efforts in actually getting this ball
- 23 rolling and making progress, and I'm excited from the
- 24 technical subcommittee and as a commissioner to really
- 25 get going on this.

1 MR. CLAYPOOL: So in the original proposal 2 that we talked about where we were talking about the 3 amount of time and the way it was compressed and our need for moving more quickly, we considered that the 4 5 fastest way to move was to use the interagency agreement 6 with UC Berkeley and with CSU Sacramento and the 7 services that could be provided by the Statewide 8 Database and the Center for Collaborative Policy. It is 9 the fastest route that we can go through. 10 If we have a contract outside of those 11 entities that's a private contract, we get into the need 12 to consider a competitive bid for those types of 13 servi ces. The only way to really not consider a 14 competitive bid is if we believe that the -- and it is 15 an acceptable contracting procedure to say we really do 16 not have the time to do that, and therefore we would 17 have to go with a sole source contract for those 18 servi ces. 19 At this point I think that the Commission 20 has to start considering whether you would like us to 21 either follow that route or whether you would like us to 22 try to put together a scope of work as quickly as 23 possible and let it to the public for the minimum 24 period, which I had originally told you was ten days but 25 was told just yesterday that DGS could do it for a

- 1 shorter period of time, although I do not believe we
- 2 would want to do it for a shorter period of time, and
- 3 then to bring back those proposals to you and say we've
- 4 matched them up and here's what they look like, and then
- 5 you would decide on the basis of what the State has
- 6 referred to as the lowest competitive bidder -- the
- 7 lowest responsible bidder, I'm sorry.
- 8 And as I was explaining to our Vice
- 9 Chair, the lowest responsible bidder -- or I'm sorry, I
- 10 believe it was Mr. Forbes. The lowest responsible
- 11 bidder is not the person who offers to do your statewide
- 12 line drawing for \$150, and there will be people who will
- 13 have those low bids. It's a comparison between those
- 14 people that you believe could responsibly provide the
- 15 services you desire for the scope of work that you have
- 16 let.
- Now, I believe that we would still have
- 18 to have some type of interagency agreement with UC
- 19 Berkeley because they have a great deal of equipment and
- 20 a great deal of -- and some services that we are going
- 21 to require. But if we don't work through UC Berkeley on
- this contract, I think it opens that avenue.
- 23 And then the only other thing that I
- 24 would say is then we have to look at it and decide do we
- 25 have that type of time. Because the actual line drawing

- 1 is a later function. You know, we can try to move this
- 2 process into that compressed time and work with it.
- 3 think it provides, if we go that route, it provides us
- 4 with the greatest picture of what is available and
- 5 the -- and who is out there, and it gives everyone a
- 6 chance to give you some perspective on what might be
- 7 offered.
- 8 But that's the option that we have as
- 9 soon as we move out. It means that we're not going
- 10 into -- we're not going into the Sacramento meeting
- 11 prepared immediately after to let contracts with the
- 12 provision that it's subject to available funds. It's
- 13 going into that knowing that we are moving forward
- 14 against what we believe that cost will be, but it will
- 15 be subject to letting the contract and then subject --
- or subject to the comparison of the bids and then
- 17 subject to the contract.
- So if I'm not clear, I'll just recap. We
- 19 can stay with UC Berkeley and say no, that's the route
- 20 we want to take and we're going to proceed through the
- 21 regions and that's how we want to contract. B, we can
- 22 say realistically do we have the time to do this and
- 23 take in this bidding process and have staff do that
- 24 additional work. Or, C, we go through competitive bid,
- 25 make a comparison, make that presentation to you, and

- 1 that's how we would let that contract. So that's for
- 2 the line drawing side of it.
- 3 On the outreach side of it it becomes
- 4 more problematic because that's a function that's going
- 5 to start earlier. And I realize that Karin has also
- 6 talked about having a function in that as well with the
- 7 line drawers, but that's just -- line drawers being
- 8 available for the presentations in some of the outreach
- 9 meetings is what I'm talking about. So that's where the
- 10 time compresses us to a greater extent, because that's
- 11 going to come first and then we're going to go into the
- 12 input meetings.
- 13 And really when you start thinking about
- 14 it and compressing this, there's going to be a portion
- of the outreach meetings that we're not going to be able
- 16 to control. And I had just spoken -- this is what I
- 17 spoke to the Vice Chair about. And what we're not going
- 18 to be able to control are meetings where people walk in
- 19 and say, "I know this is outreach, I know this is
- 20 education, but I want to give you this map because I'm
- 21 not going to be around." We've already heard people
- 22 coming in who said, just in this meeting, that, "I won't
- 23 be able to come back, so if you don't want to hear my
- 24 testimony I'll leave." And we don't want to be in the
- 25 position of not taking testimony.

1 So for that purpose, whoever is going to 2 provide that service for us has to start giving us input 3 on how we're supposed to be taking that information, and 4 so that becomes also a portion of the equation that we 5 have to think about in those three options I've offered 6 you, or those three options that I believe are available 7 to us. 8 CHAIRMAN WARD: What was the subcommittee's 9 recommendation? 10 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I'm going to defer to 11 Vince. I think you've already stated it earlier. 12 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: We did have 13 conversations around the subject, and I think we were 14 all reasonably comfortable with going with the 15 Statewide Database and using Karin in conjunction with 16 the discussions we had with the outreach group. 17 looked to us like the fastest way to get started. I 18 understand there are risks associated with it, but 19 that's a risk I'm willing to take. Because I think 20 timing is our biggest problem right now, not the kind of 21 criticisms we might get for not following all the 22 procedures correctly. 23 And my fellow committee members could 24 add --25 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Filkins Webber?

1	COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I have a
2	question, Commissioner Barabba.
3	As I understand, Mr. Claypool, as you
4	were mentioning it, Berkeley does have an interagency
5	contract so we could contract with them for the
6	Statewide Database technical consultant aspect.
7	You're shaking your head,
8	Commissioner Dai, so maybe I misunderstood.
9	COMMISSIONER DAI: So if I understand this
10	correctly, that there's potentially a facilities
11	agreement that we would do through UC Berkeley. But, as
12	I recall, Ms. Mac Donald proposed her services under Q2,
13	whatever the name of her private consulting firm.
14	COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: No, I'm only
15	talked about the we're talking about possibly two or
16	three consultants. The one consultant that you were
17	referring to was to assist us for the technical
18	component of line drawing, and that, as I understood,
19	would be from Ms. Mac Donald but only in her capacity as
20	the Statewide Database. I understand Ms. Mac Donald is
21	here also as Q2 Data Research for the outreach and what
22	was proposed.
23	But maybe we just need a quick summary on
24	the consultants that you're talking about. Because we
25	have line drawing, we have input hearings, we have

- 1 outreach, and those are consultants in various
- 2 capacities. So I guess fill me in, because I'm
- 3 confused.
- 4 MS. Mac DONALD: Okay. I'm going to try to
- 5 say some things between the lines here. We've had some
- 6 major issues with the Statewide Database being at UC
- 7 Berkeley, and there have been some funding issues. And
- 8 I think those kinds of issues, without going through the
- 9 great detail of it, may actually prevent us from doing
- 10 an interagency agreement with Berkeley for the
- 11 line-drawing component. There are some other issues,
- 12 without going into great detail of that. I can only
- 13 tell you that at this point it's February of the
- 14 redistricting year, and the redistricting database for
- 15 the State of California, despite having a line item in
- 16 the State budget, has not received funding that was
- 17 given to the University of California. That is being
- 18 worked out right now, but that should tell you something
- 19 about how sometimes these things go at the University of
- 20 California system at this point.
- So when we're looking at line drawing and
- 22 actually doing an additional contract with Berkeley, we
- 23 would all be subject to, you know, labor laws and all
- 24 kinds of regulations that are part of being an employee
- 25 at Berkeley. And I can tell you from experience that

- 1 does not mesh with the kind of work you have to do as a
- 2 redistricting consultant. It would not have meshed with
- 3 the kind of work that I have done for you guys in the
- 4 last week, you know, like no 80-, 90-hour work weeks.
- 5 That doesn't work. So there are definitely some issues
- 6 that arise.
- 7 I think what would make a lot of sense
- 8 and what really could be done, the Database has
- 9 equipment that you will need, and we have licenses from
- 10 Maptitude which cost a lot of money. So they will be
- 11 sitting there. We have a plotter. We have the entire
- 12 infrastructure. You could probably do an interagency
- agreement with the law school and basically just say,
- 14 "Okay, we're going to contract with you guys so that we
- 15 have our redistricting infrastructure set up." That
- 16 would be something that would work.
- 17 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And our hired
- 18 consultant would have access to that.
- 19 MS. Mac DONALD: Yeah. We would have to work
- 20 this all out.
- 21 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Okay. Is that
- 22 what you were suggesting, Mr. Barabba?
- Okay, I'm sorry, I misunderstood. Okay,
- 24 I appreciate that.
- MS. Mac DONALD: Also let me just add

- 1 something else. When you give a contract to Berkeley or
- 2 to I think any university, really, then you give those
- 3 funds to the university but then they're in charge of
- 4 essentially determining what happens and what kind of
- 5 work gets done even though you agree to a particular
- 6 outline.
- 7 So I mean we just had this with respect
- 8 to the outreach centers, because Irvine wanted to pay a
- 9 particular amount of money for the outreach center
- 10 directors, and that proposal is all accepted. And then
- once we went through actually classifying those jobs we
- 12 were told that they involved equity issues that Berkeley
- 13 had to look at, so at the end we actually had to pay a
- 14 different rate than what happened with Irvine. And
- 15 there was quite a gap between what the funder wanted and
- 16 what we ended up being able to do.
- 17 So these are the kind of issues that you
- 18 run into. Also contracting with the University of
- 19 California is not a fast process. It goes through, you
- 20 know, sponsored projects. It has to be approved.
- 21 There's a lot of different layers. And, in addition,
- 22 you're going to be paying for overhead. So there's a
- 23 large overhead component. So in this system, or in this
- 24 process where actually time and money are both at a
- 25 premium, you're cheaper off not going that way as well.

1 COMMISSIONER DAI: So I'll just add, since 2 Ms. Mac Donald probably had to be a little careful with 3 her words, as someone who has had personal experience 4 dealing with UC and with UC Berkeley, both as an 5 employee and as a consultant, it is very difficult to 6 get money out of the university and figure out which pot 7 of money that -- even though it's been approved and you 8 have budget for it, it's very hard to spend. So I will 9 just say that. 10 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: So I guess my 11 question is this, since it was raised with a discussion 12 of consultants. I would just like clarity as to --13 identify the consultant for me. In other words, you 14 have a redistricting line-drawing consultant, which 15 you're saying now would not be with Berkeley more than 16 So I understand that. And then we're talking 17 about the other consultants, such as CCP to assist us 18 with outreach. And then you're also looking at possibly 19 another consultant as presented by the technical 20 committee for the educational input. 21 I'd just like to summarize who these 22 consultants are so we can determine who has interagency 23 contracts that we would use, such as CCP, versus opening 24 So I'd like to get an idea of what up this bid process. 25 we're talking about in terms of scope.

- 1 MR. CLAYPOOL: I'm going to try. I want to 2 start from the bottom and just work up so that we can 3 see this kind of stack up. Or actually I apologize.
- 4 I'm going to start from the top and move down because
- 5 that's really the way it should work.
- We are going to need someone who can draw
- 7 these lines for us and take these data and produce not
- 8 only the maps but the reports that go with them. Those
- 9 individuals will either have -- in this case we would
- 10 have to have a second contract with Berkeley in order to
- 11 obtain that equipment, or the individual who offered
- 12 their services in that case would offer their own
- 13 equipment. So we would have to separate out.
- 14 That's why it was proposed to me that it
- 15 was just very simple. Everybody knows what's supposed
- 16 to be done. You get the scope of work out and you get
- 17 the responses back. But it's not that clean. We have
- 18 different types of components that will have to be
- 19 separated out. So first the line drawers, then the
- 20 equipment that needs to be let. In this case that would
- 21 be with Berkeley, or possibly a line drawer would have
- 22 that. Below that, our next level, if you will, is CCP,
- 23 the Center for Collaborative Policy. Their function --
- 24 and they're going to give you a presentation, but their
- 25 function is to work with whomever is drawing your lines

- 1 and supply the information, elicit the comments and the
- 2 types of information that needs to go to our line
- 3 drawers so that they can best do that job for you.
- 4 Now, at CCP, or whoever has that
- 5 contract, that's how we envision them. Originally when
- 6 I talked with CCP I had said, "I want it all-inclusive
- 7 because we don't have that much staff. I want you to
- 8 plan the venues and do everything that is needed to do
- 9 those venues." They came back and said, "We really
- 10 don't have the actual expertise to do the venue
- 11 acquisition. We're the people who do the meetings, and
- 12 so we have another entity, CCE, that would take care of
- 13 that part, the actual acquisition."
- So if we went with a private consultant
- to draw the lines, Berkeley, CCP and CCE, we're talking
- 16 about putting four contracts into place. The only
- 17 contract in there that has to be considered outside of
- 18 the realm of interagency agreement is the private
- 19 consultancy that Karin has spoken to. All the rest of
- 20 those entities are within the state framework and
- 21 covered by Government Code where it says if the
- 22 government has this service and they can provide a
- 23 reasonable service to you, then you should use it
- 24 because that's just an efficient way to do business. So
- 25 that's -- those are the contracts. Three can go

- 1 interagency; one has to be considered under this
- 2 al ternate mode.
- 3 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Thank you very
- 4 much, and I apologize if everybody else was up to speed
- 5 on that, but it definitely provided clarity. Thank you.
- 6 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Question. Assuming we
- 7 do have to go to at least one contract outside of the
- 8 interagency mode, you said that we can avoid the
- 9 competitive bid process if there's sort of a temporal
- 10 urgency to it, which we sort of feel. But what are sort
- 11 of the limits to that in saying it's really too little
- 12 time to do a competitive bid, and are we close to that
- 13 at this point?
- MR. CLAYPOOL: So we never want to avoid the
- 15 competitive bid if we're going into the private contract
- 16 arena, but there are circumstances where -- I now give
- 17 you a great example of that. When LA -- I believe that
- 18 when LA had the freeway that collapsed, I believe they
- 19 went on a sole source contract, Caltrans, because they
- 20 needed a freeway. So they said, "We don't have time to
- 21 add the time that's necessary to get this job done, so
- 22 we're going to go to a contractor we know can get the
- 23 job done," and they structured the contract in that way.
- When you have a compressed timeframe like
- 25 this it allows you to make that consideration and say,

- 1 in our minds, we have to get going on this with
- 2 enough -- in order to finish within the timeframe, and
- 3 ours is August 15th. Are we close to being at that
- 4 time? If we make this decision to go to a competitive
- 5 bid, I mean staff starts out on Sunday. I mean we have
- 6 to start putting together the scope of work that we
- 7 would request from these bidders. We have to work
- 8 through whichever subcommittee -- I'm assuming this
- 9 would be probably both the technical committee and the
- 10 finance committee -- to say this is what we're asking
- 11 for. Take a look at it. Give us your edits. And we
- 12 have to be very, very careful.
- And, again, I'm going to go back to this,
- 14 because this isn't a process that we can just roll out
- and everybody is going to give us the same bid. And
- 16 I'll give you one example of that. When we did the
- 17 original competitive bid at the Bureau of State Audits
- 18 for the contractor for our public relations, we worked
- 19 for about a week, week and a half, and we thought that
- 20 we had a very, very tight scope of work, and we sent it
- 21 out, and it just came back all over the boards. I mean
- 22 we really couldn't make a basis of comparison because we
- 23 hadn't been careful enough in structuring how
- 24 individuals should give us back their information. So
- 25 we had people who were giving us an hourly rate, people

- 1 who were giving us the big picture. It was a mess. So
- 2 we had to relet that RFP to make sure that we got groups
- 3 that we could compare. Now, in that case, you know, the
- 4 second time it came out Ogilvy International was a clear
- 5 winner, and by a good comparison.
- 6 But that's the danger of going too
- 7 quickly on letting that contract. And I'll just give
- 8 you give you the adage: You never have enough time to
- 9 do it the first time but you've always got enough time
- 10 to do it the second. Well, we don't. So we have to
- 11 make sure that the first time we let this, that if we
- 12 went that route, that we got it back.
- Adding that in, can we go out to RFP and
- 14 get it back in time? It would be close. It would be
- 15 close, but I think that there is that possibility. And
- 16 so I would say that that might, for the purposes of
- 17 this, that might be the clearest route to go.
- Now, let me step back on the outreach
- 19 function. Because that's first in the line of what
- 20 we're doing, I have a real hard time thinking that we
- 21 can go out to outreach and still meet your March
- 22 schedule of setting in place meetings and so forth for
- 23 people to -- and have the information in place and the
- 24 types of things that we need in order to start eliciting
- 25 information. But part of the information that we were

- 1 talking about getting, even then, would be some of that
- 2 input information that would be going to our line
- 3 drawer. So that's where these two plans kind of mesh
- 4 over.
- 5 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I have a
- 6 question. If you don't feel that we have enough time,
- 7 counsel, Mr. Miller, would you agree that if we had to
- 8 consider moving forward on a contract it would be
- 9 permissible, given the limitation that we have in time
- 10 and what Mr. Claypool has just described, for us to move
- 11 forward on the educational schedule and the workshop
- 12 schedule and the hearing schedule?
- 13 MR. MILLER: I think -- I don't believe I can
- 14 make a better judgment or add to the wisdom of the
- 15 Commission on the issue of whether there's enough time
- 16 to do a competitive bid or not. I do feel that the
- 17 decision about drawing the lines together with the
- 18 decision about who the Voting Rights counsel is are the
- 19 two critical building blocks to the success of the
- 20 overall project.
- 21 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Commissioner Ward? It
- 22 seems to me that I was under the impression that we
- 23 wanted to get a contract let at the next meeting, which
- 24 was going to be sometime around February 22nd. And in
- 25 fact that is on our agenda, to get that accomplished.

- 1 And it sounds to me like I don't think we can go to a
- 2 competitive bid and get that ready for the 22nd.
- 3 MR. CLAYPOOL: What we were intending to come
- 4 out with -- and I'm going to move back just to make sure
- 5 that we're clear, that we would come out of here with
- 6 the structure to make the cost estimates that we need to
- 7 make, that we would then go into the 27th and say if we
- 8 put all these services in at these costs, that that's
- 9 how much it would cost. And then we would go to the
- 10 Department of Finance for the release of the million and
- 11 for additional funds as necessary.
- The contracts that we're talking about
- 13 for the line drawing would occur after that point. And
- 14 no matter what contracts we put into place, they are all
- 15 going to be subject to available funds. They're going
- to be subject to if we don't get the money we need to
- 17 move back. So I'm saying that those contracts will be
- 18 put into place after we have your approval as to the
- 19 budgetary amount that we're talking about.
- 20 If you come back and say, "No, we don't
- 21 want to ask for that much," then we have to step back
- 22 and say, "Well, what do we cut out of this in order to
- 23 have the plan that fits the amount of money you want to
- 24 spend." But it's always been my assumption that we
- 25 would go into that knowing that these were the estimates

- 1 we had and that we would start looking for the money and
- 2 letting the contracts after that.
- 3 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I guess the question is
- 4 how do you get the estimates if you don't have the
- 5 person in mind?
- 6 MR. CLAYPOOL: A case in point I'm assuming
- 7 would be IT specialists. We're going to get -- we're
- 8 going to go out and cost out what a reasonable cost for
- 9 our webmaster is going to be, for instance, and we're
- 10 going to come back to you and say, "This is how much
- 11 that we've been quoted would be the reasonable price for
- 12 a webmaster, and so this is what we're going to put in
- the budget," and then that's what we're going to
- 14 contract for. So we're going to look for estimates that
- 15 way, but we're not necessarily going to put contracts in
- 16 place if we can't pay for them.
- 17 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Would you be able to do
- 18 that for the persons who are going to draw the lines?
- 19 MR. CLAYPOOL: Well, one of two ways. We
- 20 either say we're going to go with this person, because
- 21 we have this compressed timeframe and they gave us their
- 22 estimate, or we go to a request for proposal, and we're
- 23 there. I mean but those are the two ways that we can
- 24 come up with that number. But even then you have to
- 25 remember that whatever number they give us isn't a

- 1 contract; it's subject to available funds.
- 2 COMMISSIONER YAO: We're on the topic of
- 3 outreach at this point in time, and if I was going to
- 4 take a look at the total picture I would say our clear
- 5 responsibility is drawing the lines, okay, with or
- 6 without input, because I have to have the lines ready on
- 7 the date that we promised to deliver the lines. But
- 8 we'd like to do as much outreach as possible in order to
- 9 draw the good line, okay.
- But yet you're asking us to approve the
- 11 budget for the outreach without -- at least I don't have
- 12 any feel as to how much money is -- should be spent for
- 13 the drawing the line and how much money should be spent
- 14 on the outreach. You're going to come back and you're
- 15 saying, "I'm going to tell you how much it will cost,"
- 16 but I'm still having a little difficulty in terms of can
- 17 we afford it.
- 18 I know that we can assume at this point
- 19 in time we got three and a half million dollars left,
- 20 okay, and we already made commitment on spending so much
- 21 money on the staffing. That much we pretty much
- 22 committed already, and we agree with you that we have to
- 23 spend that amount of money. But in order to approve
- 24 proceeding with any other expenditure, including the
- outreach, we know we have to make that commitment. We

- 1 know that we have to do it right now.
- 2 But help me to understand this. How can
- 3 we approve, whether it's a sole source or whether it's a
- 4 competitive bid or anything else, without having some
- 5 guidance or limitation as to what we're approving?
- 6 Because one thing I can't do is I can't give you a blank
- 7 check and say go and make the outreach happen.
- 8 MR. CLAYPOOL: So to go back and to say,
- 9 again, we're going to come out of this meeting, or this
- 10 session with the structure that you believe you want to
- 11 move forward with, and then we're going to move forward
- 12 into the September -- or I'm sorry. I'm looking way
- 13 past. We're going to move into the second half of this
- 14 month's agenda in Sacramento where we're going to say,
- 15 "This is what you said you want. If we get approval for
- 16 this amount of money, this is what we're going to move
- 17 forward with." We need that structure in order to be
- 18 able to go to the Department of Finance and say this is
- 19 how much this proposal costs, and clearly we need the
- 20 release of the million dollars and we need the
- 21 additional funds for this -- for the rest of it. It's
- 22 the mechanism by which we ask for the funding.
- 23 And when we get the funding, then if we
- 24 get the full amount we can put this -- we can put this
- 25 entire plan into play. If, however, the legislature

- 1 says, "No, there's no available funding," then we say,
- 2 "Okay, but will you release the million?" And they say,
- 3 "Sure." Well, now we know we have a three and a
- 4 half million budget and we have to scale back whatever
- 5 our plan is to fit that amount of money. If the
- 6 Department of Finance says, "No, we won't give you
- 7 the million either," then we have to scale back to fit
- 8 everything we're going to do in a two and a half million
- 9 budget or whatever it is.
- But the point here is that we have to go
- 11 to them with what we want and what we believe we need in
- order to implement this the way the Commission believes
- 13 it should be, and then have them either tell us yes or
- 14 no. So we're not -- all we're doing is saying in
- 15 Sacramento, "This is what we believe we should have.
- 16 This is what we want you to fund. What will you give
- 17 us?"
- 18 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Can I try and untangle
- 19 this issue just a little bit here. It seems like what
- 20 we need to vote on -- we have the issue. What we're
- 21 discussing is the type of contracts we're going to be
- 22 having. There are four types of consultants we're
- 23 Looking at. Three of those, we have an avenue for
- 24 contracting with them. The fourth one is to do the
- 25 actual -- with the line drawer. And I think, based on

- 1 all the information that we've received, the training
- 2 we've done with Karin Mac Donald, that it would be in
- 3 our best interest to enter into a contract.
- 4 I'm suggesting to the Commission that we
- 5 enter into a contract with Karin, and because of our
- 6 compressed timeframe that we look at the option of doing
- 7 the sole source provider. If we do that, in trying to
- 8 address Commissioner Yao's concern, we are not -- it's
- 9 my understanding we would not be writing a blank check.
- 10 We would simply be authorizing the entering into a
- 11 contract with Karin.
- 12 And, as a Commission, that means the risk
- 13 we are accepting is not a blank check risk. The risk
- 14 we're accepting is that Karin would then come to us with
- 15 a reasonable budget and proposal in relationship to the
- 16 parameters that we've discussed for the educational
- 17 meetings and the input meetings, and that if we did not
- 18 like and we did not accept elements or the complete
- 19 budget that we would accept the risk that Karin could
- 20 adjust that to an acceptable budgetary limit for what we
- 21 need.
- So, again, we're not committing to any
- 23 amount. We're simply committing to engaging in a
- 24 contract as a sole source provider with Karin so that we
- 25 can then later on make a determination about the budget.

- 1 But the risk we have to assume is that Karin is
- 2 professional, is competent in this area, and can provide
- 3 us with what we need.
- 4 Can I just say that's a motion?
- 5 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Second.
- 6 CHAIRMAN WARD: Any discussion from the panel
- 7 on that motion?
- 8 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Commissioner Ward, after
- 9 yesterday's experience I will be recusing myself from
- 10 this vote because I am familiar with Karin Mac Donald,
- 11 have known her for a very long time, both professionally
- 12 and personally, so I'll be recusing myself from this
- 13 vote.
- 14 CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you,
- 15 Commissioner Blanco.
- 16 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I just wanted to
- 17 comment on Commissioner DiGuilio's comment, that that's
- 18 the concurrence that we had on the technical advisory
- 19 subcommittee, and I think Commissioner Barabba concurs
- and also Commissioner Aguirre.
- 21 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Blanco, did you
- 22 hit that again or is it still on?
- 23 If there's no further comment I'm going
- 24 to open up the public microphone. Comments will be
- 25 accepted strictly on the motion at hand.

- 1 AUDI ENCE MEMBER: Good afternoon. Deanna
- 2 Kitamura with the Asian Pacific American Legal Center.
- 3 Regardless of the process, I just want to say that I'm
- 4 concerned with any delay in getting the map drawer on
- 5 board. We have two in-house demographers in our office,
- 6 and they have been working on maps regarding the
- 7 Asian-American/Pacific Islander communities of interest
- 8 since the beginning of this year. And that's just
- 9 focused on the API community.
- 10 In March you're likely to start getting a
- 11 lot of input from a lot of people, even in the
- 12 educational meetings, as you guys were expressing, and
- 13 you need to have the mapper on board in March to be able
- 14 to start doing the work on the maps, and also to be able
- 15 to start inputting the data that you receive from the
- 16 public into the Statewide Database.
- 17 Thank you.
- 18 CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you.
- 19 AUDI ENCE MEMBER: Hi. Again, Douglas Johnson
- 20 from the Rose Institute.
- 21 Let me do one thing, first strenuously
- 22 object to the motion and ask you to vote no on this,
- 23 and, second, offer an alternative idea. Rather than
- 24 going with a sole source no bid to a for-profit private
- 25 company, which is the motion you're making today, let me

- 1 suggest that you simply put out a notice in an hour
- 2 saying this is what Prop 11 tells us to do in the
- 3 technical line-drawing side. Just pull language right
- 4 out of there. Anyone interested please give us -- and
- 5 you can do it two ways -- an official proposal or just a
- 6 ballpark informational item.
- 7 And I can tell you -- because I know the
- 8 Rose Institute will do this and I know all the
- 9 professionals in this field can do it very easily -- at
- 10 your Sacramento meeting you'll have those in hand. You
- 11 can have very detailed proposals or you can have
- 12 ballpark proposals simply by asking for them. There's
- 13 no need to make a decision now on a sole source or
- 14 anythi ng.
- The same thing for the Voting Rights
- 16 lawyers. If you simply put out a request right now
- 17 saying that this is what Prop 11 says we need, give us
- 18 your proposals, you could have those in hand with dollar
- 19 figures, with proposed scope of work. Obviously it
- 20 would be a menu. You guys would need to go through and
- 21 choose what you actually want to do.
- 22 But if you simply made that motion now
- 23 saying let's put out a notice saying this is what
- 24 Prop 11 expects us to do, please come to Sacramento with
- 25 those proposals, you'll get them. And you'll get a lot

- 1 of them. And that will give you a nice broad field.
- 2 I mean, Commissioner Forbes, you
- 3 mentioned earlier about how no one had given you
- 4 alternative outreach plans. It's because you haven't
- 5 asked. So I would encourage you now to ask and put out
- 6 this notice to anyone who wants to provide you
- 7 information, not just to one party.
- 8 Thank you very much.
- 9 CHAI RMAN WARD: Thank you.
- 10 Any additional panel discussion on this
- 11 motion?
- 12 Commi ssi oner Raya?
- 13 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I just want to hear the
- 14 whole thing again, please, if I may.
- 15 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: My explanations behind
- 16 it as well?
- 17 COMMISSIONER RAYA: No, just the motion.
- 18 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: The motion is, because
- 19 of our compressed timeframe, to enter into a sole source
- 20 contract with Karin Mac Donald for the line drawing and
- 21 technical aspects of the Commission.
- 22 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: More
- 23 specifically, when you say "Karin Mac Donald," you mean
- 24 Q2 Data Research?
- 25 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: Maybe I should get

- 1 clarification from Karin that that's how you'd like it
- 2 to be referred to.
- 3 Okay, Q2 Data Research.
- 4 CHAIRMAN WARD: Public comment had closed for
- 5 this item, but I'm happy to hear you anyway, sir, if
- 6 you'd like to step up.
- 7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm Bill Robinson from the
- 8 Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District.
- 9 We're going to be going through an internal
- 10 redistricting process ourselves.
- 11 I just wanted to underline the previous
- 12 gentleman's comments. I think if you want to save money
- 13 potentially and work creatively on the problem I think
- 14 you open yourself to a wide scope of possibilities if
- 15 you, instead of sole source, if you just put out a
- 16 general proposal. As long as it's put into publications
- 17 that have a wide distribution, I'm sure you'll have a
- 18 good response.
- 19 So I just wanted to underline the
- 20 previous gentleman's objection.
- 21 CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you, sir.
- 22 Mr. Claypool?
- 23 MR. CLAYPOOL: The only caveat I would say to
- 24 what was discussed is that I wouldn't be comfortable
- 25 sending out a message in an hour saying bring me your

- 1 proposal. That's all. I believe, again, and I'm going
- 2 to say it again, you have to have some basis by which
- 3 you can make these comparisons. Otherwise we're going
- 4 to get mired into the process of people giving us
- 5 proposals that will be either very hard or almost
- 6 impossible to make a comparison between. That's just
- 7 been my experience. I've never asked for a line drawer
- 8 proposal but I just don't believe that without having
- 9 structure to that process that we can get something
- 10 that's easily comparable. But perhaps there's a
- 11 different opinion.
- 12 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Forbes?
- 13 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes, I appreciate the
- 14 comment about the desirability of additional proposals,
- 15 and I think if we had time that may be a factor. But
- 16 for me personally, I've had an opportunity to observe
- 17 Karin's work for the last three months, and I balance
- 18 the confidence that that observation has given me
- 19 relative to our timeline. I'm comfortable with the
- 20 motion.
- 21 COMMISSIONER DAI: I just wanted to add that I
- 22 think that consideration of a sole source contract is
- 23 actually -- it's a serious matter. It would potentially
- 24 open the Commission up to criticism. I think it's a
- 25 fair comment by Mr. Johnson that we haven't asked. We

- 1 only asked for a quick, one consultant on this.
- 2 However, I also understand Mr. Claypool's concern. You
- 3 know, it's not reasonable to put something vague out.
- 4 Normally there's a request for proposal and it has some
- 5 structure to it.
- 6 So if we were going to do that we would
- 7 have to ask for line drawings within the context of the
- 8 motions that we've already approved, which is a
- 9 nine-region approach with 27 to 36 meetings. I mean
- 10 that's the structure that would have to go out in that
- 11 so the proposals would be comparable.
- So I guess the question I would have for
- 13 the Commission is do we feel that that's specific
- 14 enough. Because we have approved to pay Ms. Mac Donald
- 15 for her work so far in developing this approach, which
- 16 we have approved, and the question is do we want to open
- 17 it up to other people to implement that approach.
- 18 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Ancheta?
- 19 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yes, I have some
- 20 discomfort with moving ahead with this motion, although
- 21 I share the other commissioners' sense of urgency. And
- 22 this is not a reflection at all on Karin's work, either.
- 23 It's just that the number of line-drawing contractors is
- 24 pretty small, actually. And I'm really torn on this,
- 25 because there are a number of very competent and very

- 1 experienced contractors out there, but it is a small
- 2 number. And I don't know that all of the issues that
- 3 Mr. Claypool has raised will necessarily come up, but
- 4 it's a very tight timeline.
- 5 So I'm really not very sure how I want to
- 6 vote on this one. But it seems to me that the data that
- 7 will be input into the Statewide Database is not
- 8 available until mid-April, in terms of usable form, and
- 9 I don't know if that's a workable timeline. But I'd
- 10 inject that into the discussion because I think that's
- 11 sort of the drop-dead deadline to have the map drawer
- 12 online.
- Now, having said that, we do need to have
- 14 guidance from somebody, whether it's Karin or some
- 15 contractor, on the data we need to solicit and the
- 16 information that we need to provide to the public in
- 17 these initial educational and input meetings. Because
- 18 the map drawer needs to say to us, "Well, this is what
- 19 we need to draw the lines. Here's what you have to tell
- 20 the public to produce at these -- to be trained on and
- 21 so provide input at the public input meetings."
- Again, I'm not really sure how I'm going
- 23 to vote on this one again, but I think that timeline has
- to be explored more critically because I'm not
- 25 comfortable at this point really going with a single

- 1 source.
- 2 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: But if I'm --
- and correct me if I'm wrong, that the motion as
- 4 presented was a sole source contract for Q2 for the
- 5 educational workshops and the input. What we're
- 6 actually getting also from Ms. Mac Donald I think
- 7 touches your point. But I don't think this proposal is
- 8 consideration of a line drawer or having her be an
- 9 expert for a line drawer, even though I see your point,
- 10 Commissioner Ancheta, but I think capitalizing on
- 11 Ms. Mac Donald's expertise somewhat in that regard. But
- 12 it was my understanding the motion was limited at this
- 13 point for sole source for the educational workshops and
- 14 the input and not the line drawer.
- 15 Or yes, the line drawer?
- 16 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: I suppose -- I was
- 17 under the assumption that it would include line drawing
- 18 because of her technical skills. If that's a point of
- 19 the discussion, that you would like to separate those
- 20 out, I suppose we can have that form of discussion. But
- 21 originally I assumed it would be for her technical
- 22 skills in relationship to the educational workshops and
- 23 the input hearings, as well as her line-drawing skills.
- 24 I'm not sure. Maybe she could address this, if those
- 25 can be separated in the sense that if you're doing the

- 1 line drawing...
- 2 MS. Mac DONALD: I think it becomes more
- 3 expensive as you start pulling these components apart.
- 4 Because initially I mean even the approach -- and I
- 5 think you're going to probably hear the same from the
- 6 outreach consultants as well.
- 7 I mean if you can plan for a larger
- 8 project, then you just approach things differently. You
- 9 approach them with an eye to, you know, figuring out
- 10 particular regions so that they can be, you know, mapped
- in a certain way. You figure out which mappers to
- 12 assign to what area, how things interact. It becomes
- 13 more expensive. Could it be done? I suppose it could
- 14 be done. It's probably going to take a little longer.
- 15 I'd like to echo the comment from APALC.
- 16 While you -- and commenting on what you just said about
- 17 the deadline and the availability of the
- 18 Statewide Database in its complete format. You can
- 19 start drawing; you just cannot start drawing any
- 20 districts with Voting Rights Act concerns. So basically
- 21 Section 5 counties and then anything Section 2, you
- 22 would have to wait until you have the entire data set
- 23 together. But there are of course a lot of areas where
- 24 that's not going to be an issue, so some of that could
- 25 already be done, maybe in the north or so, if you work

- 1 through that.
- 2 So, you know, scheduling is going to be
- 3 affected as well as I think cost. Could it be done? It
- 4 could be. It's just it becomes a little more messy, you
- 5 know.
- 6 Does that answer the question?
- 7 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And I think part of
- 8 that aspect within these meetings that we're proposing,
- 9 particularly the public input hearings in phase two,
- 10 would be the actual line drawing that's going to take
- 11 place in those meetings. So it would be the technical
- 12 consulting but the actual beginning of line drawing.
- 13 MS. Mac DONALD: May I actually clarify
- 14 something? Somebody said this earlier. These nine
- 15 regions for the hearings, they're not meant to in any
- 16 way suggest that these are communities of interest or
- 17 that they're going to be in any way used as line
- 18 modules, for lack of better terminology. These really
- 19 are just units in which you can organize yourselves so
- 20 you can get input. Because I think that's the most
- 21 pressing issue right now. So let's just make sure we're
- 22 not looking at this as some sort of a suggestion that
- there might be a line there or anything should be
- 24 happening there.
- 25 CHAIRMAN WARD: We have a motion on the floor.

- 1 Is there any other discussion regarding that motion at
- 2 this moment?
- 3 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Yes. If I have
- 4 the correct understanding of the motion, which would be
- 5 a sole source contract to Q2 for line drawing and
- 6 everything else that's been presented by Ms. Mac Donald
- 7 for educational workshops and input, then now that I
- 8 have an accurate understanding clarified by the
- 9 subcommittee I am troubled by the sole source contract
- 10 as well. I was understanding that we were splitting it
- 11 up.
- 12 I think, based on the timeline that we do
- 13 have here in looking at the calendar, even if we could
- 14 get something out, I think obviously it would have to be
- 15 within the parameters of what we've already discussed,
- 16 as Commissioner Dai has said, and that might be
- 17 something we can put together.
- 18 And, Mr. Claypool, I certainly understand
- 19 what you're saying, but if we put together a proposal
- 20 based on what we've passed today, I'm afraid I would
- 21 have to agree that we would have to consider putting
- 22 that out there for bid given that this contract is a
- 23 little broader than what my understanding was initially.
- 24 And I don't know if it has to be ten days, as you had
- 25 suggested. We could even shorten it a little more. And

- 1 we might be able to have proposals for consideration by
- 2 our meeting in Sacramento.
- 3 And that's just the further discussion I
- 4 have on that. Thank you.
- 5 CHAIRMAN WARD: Any other comment from the
- 6 Commission?
- 7 Commi ssi oner Agui rre?
- 8 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes. We had a comment
- 9 by Commissioner DiGuilio that if there was a need to
- 10 separate the line drawing out that perhaps we could
- 11 consider the first part. Am I correct in that?
- 12 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think I just was
- 13 addressing -- I guess logistically I wasn't sure if I
- 14 could amend the proposal to do that, to separate those
- 15 out, if that would address commissioners' concerns, or
- 16 if we just stick with the original proposal which I
- 17 understood to be the inclusion of all those elements.
- 18 CHAIRMAN WARD: The current motion on the
- 19 floor is all-encompassing.
- 20 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Just on that
- 21 point, Commissioner Aguirre, I think Ms. Mac Donald
- 22 makes a point, that if we do start breaking it out it's
- 23 going to get a second.
- 24 CHAIRMAN WARD: As a point of order can I
- verify did the original motion have a second?

1	COMMISSION MEMBER: Yes.
2	CHAIRMAN WARD: Okay. Commissioner Dai?
3	COMMISSIONER DAI: I guess my question is,
4	given that we don't have a number yet so we don't really
5	have a full proposal yet, I wonder what it would hurt to
6	put out a request for a proposal and stipulate that it
7	has to be ready in time for our Sacramento meeting so
8	that we have a couple options to consider.
9	CHAIRMAN WARD: Mr. Claypool?
10	MR. CLAYPOOL: We have, between now and our
11	Sacramento meeting, to start, we have twelve days, so
12	we're going to need some period of time in order to
13	structure the scope of work. I'm assuming that you're
14	going to want to have some input in that. What I would
15	suggest is, if we go to an RFP, that we just consider
16	that we notice a special meeting to make that
17	consideration beyond our Sacramento meeting.
18	Because I don't know that we're you're
19	going to have to consider these options together, and I
20	can't guarantee you, one, that we will get a special
21	dispensation below ten days, which is the time, and,
22	two, that we can get you the scope of work that we need
23	to have and then get it back and put it in place in the
24	format that's required for consideration. It's just
25	it's a very tight compression of a process that I

- 1 still -- I'm very uncomfortable simply letting it go
- 2 with, "Read Prop 11 and send me a proposal." I just
- 3 cannot believe that we will get comparable proposals
- 4 that way.
- 5 So if we did that I would just propose
- 6 that beyond the Sacramento meeting we notice just a
- 7 one-day meeting, if for nothing else similar to the one
- 8 we are noticing for the legal subcommittee. Perhaps
- 9 that should be the vehicle, that we have that meeting
- 10 encompass the results of the requests as well as a
- 11 breakout for the legal subcommittee. But that's what I
- would be more comfortable with.
- 13 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Can I just say that I
- think there's a couple issues that the commissioners
- 15 need to take into consideration regarding this. And I
- 16 don't want to sound like it's a strong arm, but I do
- 17 think there are implications if we put this off, the
- 18 first being the February 26 educational workshop. If we
- 19 do not have the technical expertise I don't see how we
- 20 could undertake that. So if we're going to wait for
- 21 that technical expertise, that will push our educational
- 22 workshops -- if we do educational workshops it will push
- 23 it off, or if we look at it as a statewide input.
- 24 Secondly, I think the point -- as
- commissioners we also need to consider that if,

- 1 according to Mr. Claypool, we go the route of an RFP,
- 2 request for proposal, we run the risk -- we have to
- 3 understand that we're running the risk that it will be
- 4 kicked back to us. We might not be able to get it in
- 5 the ten-day deadline. Even once we get those proposals
- 6 it may be hard to mesh them up to compare apples to
- 7 apples. If we accept that risk, then I say we can move
- 8 forward. But I think the Commission needs to understand
- 9 that we may not even reach the February 26th deadline
- 10 with this in terms of even getting an RFP out. We're
- 11 kind of choosing between two not very optimal choices
- 12 here, but something's going to have to give. We have to
- decide what our opportunity cost is here in order to get
- 14 the biggest benefit.
- 15 CHAIRMAN WARD: Just to make a general
- 16 statement, Karin Mac Donald was a paid consultant for
- 17 the Commission, so we've consulted her on this
- 18 presentation. We'll open it up for public comment very
- 19 shortly so we can certainly get all feedback.
- 20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I think I can save you a lot
- 21 of time.
- 22 CHAIRMAN WARD: We'll get there.
- 23 I want to ask Mr. Claypool if he can just
- 24 give us a real briefidea of the time impact either way.
- 25 I just heard a statement that said that we would not be

- 1 able to move forward with getting educational workshop
- 2 proposals and things like that.
- 3 MR. CLAYPOOL: Two points of clarity that I
- 4 think we need to have. The proposed workshop on the
- 5 26th and 27th was proposed to us by the Center For
- 6 Collaborative Policy as a very good venue for having
- 7 statewide groups like Common Cause and so forth come and
- 8 give you input on what is being done, you know, out
- 9 there in California as far as reaching out to
- 10 individuals. So in that regard I'm going to call it a
- 11 very safe venue. You may receive some public input
- 12 there, but we will be -- you know, we're going to be
- 13 videotaping it, and so we can direct whoever does this
- 14 function to us that there was some input in there that
- 15 they need to consider. But I don't think that that
- 16 particular type of presentation is in danger of us
- 17 losing some input. That would be that.
- The second thing is, can we get an RFP
- 19 out ahead of that meeting? Yes, absolutely we can do
- 20 that. I'm not concerned about getting an RFP out, but
- 21 my concern is that the comment was made to send it out
- 22 today. And I just -- I don't have that level of comfort
- 23 with this. If we're going to get summary proposals
- 24 back, as Commissioner Dai said, we already have agreed
- on what we want, so we have to structure that into the

- 1 proposal and send it out and allow individuals to take
- 2 that into consideration as a structure in what they're
- 3 going to send back to us. We also have to the structure
- 4 that RFP so that we tell individuals, "If you are going
- 5 to provide your own equipment, your own service, that
- 6 has to be separated." The thing we're going to go to
- 7 Berkeley for, in addition to Karin's services, we have
- 8 to separate that out, so, again, we're making a fair
- 9 comparison on what we're getting for what we're
- 10 proposi ng.
- 11 So the only reason I'm proposing that we
- 12 make a full session out of the legal subcommittee
- 13 meeting is because I don't know that we can get
- 14 everything back and everything compared by the
- 15 Sacramento meeting. If we got it back and we got a
- 16 comparison and we were prepared to make that
- 17 presentation at the Sacramento meeting, then I would say
- 18 we will make that presentation. We will come to you and
- 19 say this is a comparison; this is what it looks like.
- 20 And then you can make that statement. I just cannot
- 21 guarantee you that we will get it back in that timeframe
- 22 because I don't know what the Department of General
- 23 Services is going to say about giving us a dispensation
- 24 in less than ten days. That's my issue.
- 25 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Yao?

- 1 COMMISSIONER YAO: I know we're putting a lot
- 2 of pressure on you. And, sitting in this seat, not
- 3 having options to choose from is really not making any
- 4 decisions. Listening to you telling us that this is the
- 5 only way we can go, whatever decision I make is going to
- 6 be very arbitrary. Either I support you or I don't
- 7 support you. What I'm asking is, can we continue
- 8 working with Karin and support the outreach program
- 9 without losing schedule and pursue the competitive
- 10 contract on the map drawing?
- 11 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: I believe if we go
- 12 that route, at the very least -- I know she's far
- 13 exceeded the original hours that we allocated to her, so
- 14 we'd have to address that issue.
- 15 COMMISSIONER YAO: Yeah, I'm sure she
- 16 definitely would have an opinion on this, because what
- 17 I'm asking is probably beyond what we talked about in
- 18 past decisions. But the question for Mr. Claypool is,
- 19 do we have that option?
- 20 MR. CLAYPOOL: You heard from the one speaker
- 21 that you need to have these line drawers in place in
- 22 March. So we are absolutely talking about exceeding
- 23 that schedule for those types of services. You heard
- 24 Karin say that we need to have -- it can get messy if we
- 25 try to separate these out and bring somebody else on

- 1 board. So all of these things are addressing exactly
- 2 what you're talking about.
- 3 Do we have time to go with a competitive
- 4 bid? We looked at the timeline and we can say, sure, if
- 5 we're looking at not getting this data back until a
- 6 certain time period for the census data, then this
- 7 process will fit into that segment. But, yeah, we will
- 8 be eating up some portion of time that might be better
- 9 spent if we had somebody in place. But, again, it's a
- 10 matter of the risk that we wish to assume. So I'm
- 11 saying we have to weigh this as a Commission, and I have
- 12 to get my direction from you as to how much risk you
- 13 wish to assume in this process.
- 14 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I have one other
- 15 question. One of the concerns that you had,
- 16 Mr. Claypool, is that you may not get the special
- 17 dispensation for less than the ten days. My question
- 18 is, could you put in a request of DGS for the special
- 19 dispensation without having put together the full
- 20 proposal, or the request for the bids? Could you put in
- 21 a request and then they could do it quickly to say,
- 22 "Yes, you can do this in a short amount of time." Or do
- 23 they require the request for special dispensation along
- 24 with your actual proposal or solicitation for bids?
- MR. CLAYPOOL: I've never let one that way so

- 1 I can't tell you how they'll respond. But what I will
- 2 say is this. I believe that the Department of General
- 3 Services would rather consider a request for a special
- 4 dispensation in order to accommodate a competitive bid
- 5 than to have to consider a sole source contract.
- 6 Because they always wish to have that process in order
- 7 to ensure that we have a fair process.
- 8 I'm going back to my address to
- 9 Commissioner Yao. I can't tell you how far this will
- 10 impact us. I can only say that I believe that if we go
- 11 that route we might get a favorable dispensation. But I
- 12 can't make that guarantee, and that's why I'm asking for
- 13 the extension of the full Commission meeting in case we
- 14 don't meet it. It allows us to notice it, and basically
- 15 it gives us a one-week extension to take care of any
- 16 business that comes up that we couldn't account for.
- 17 That's all.
- 18 COMMISSIONER YAO: Give me a ballpark number,
- 19 the dollar amount that we're talking about. Is it
- 20 \$100,000? Is it a million dollars? What is it that
- 21 we're talking about? Because going on a sole source
- 22 contract on dollars that's unspecified, that's part of
- 23 my uncomfortable position.
- MR. CLAYPOOL: I would suggest that perhaps
- 25 you have two individuals here who might be able to give

- 1 you that ballpark figure. But, Commissioner Yao, I
- 2 don't know without going to these individuals and
- 3 saying, with this proposal, how much. That was the
- 4 whole purpose of this meeting, was to obtain that type
- 5 of data so that we can move forward and structure our
- 6 comments to the Department of Finance. I can't tell you
- 7 how much the line drawing component is going to be.
- 8 COMMISSIONER YAO: Okay, I'm not really asking
- 9 for a quote at this point in time. I know we're trying
- 10 to get the quote. What is a not-to-exceed number? Can
- 11 we at least get that, because that makes a big
- 12 difference in terms of me approving it or not approving
- 13 it.
- 14 COMMISSIONER DAI: Can we ask the individuals
- 15 rather than asking Mr. Claypool?
- 16 COMMISSIONER YAO: Right.
- 17 CHAIRMAN WARD: If the Commission's will is to
- open the microphone to the public, I'm happy to do that
- 19 at this time. So we'll go ahead and open the floor.
- 20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Mr. Chairman, I think I can
- 21 save you a lot of time. As Dr. Ancheta, I think,
- 22 mentioned, this is a very small universe. I have my
- 23 own -- I'm not against for-profits. I have my own.
- 24 We're actually doing the city of Stockton.
- So we all know what each other charges.

- 1 You don't have to put out an RFP. Simply put out a
- 2 request for information, a non-binding request for
- 3 information, and we'll give you the ballparks for your
- 4 next meeting. And then you can figure out whether you
- 5 want to -- I mean you can write an RFP off of those
- 6 informational items. Simply put out a press release
- 7 asking for guidance on what ballpark you're looking at
- 8 and what choices you need to make. That's all you need
- 9 to do, is ask. It doesn't have to be a formal RFP.
- 10 So that's what I'm suggesting. You don't
- 11 have to do the RFP. And plus you're talking about a
- 12 sole source contract for something that you might not
- 13 even do. Remember your motion earlier today is to
- 14 consider the cost of these educational outreach
- 15 sessions. You haven't actually voted to do them yet.
- So, ballpark, you're probably talking,
- 17 you know, depending on what options you choose, you
- 18 could probably get it -- you know, really skim on the
- 19 services, for \$300,000 maybe. But you're probably
- 20 talking, given what I suspect you want to do, \$600,000
- 21 to a million dollars. But again, if you simply put out
- 22 a press release asking people to share this information
- 23 with you at a certain time, you'll get it.
- MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay. So the thing I would
- 25 like to -- oh, I'm sorry.

- 1 MS. MAC DONALD: Well, I don't know what to
- 2 tell you. I've been called the cheapest redistricting
- 3 consultant out there. Not to say that I'm cheap. The
- 4 most inexpensive one. But I am a cheapskate.
- 5 But, anyway, I think these proposals -- I
- 6 have to agree with Dan. The devil really is in the
- 7 details. When we bid on the San Diego proposal I think
- 8 there was one proposal that came in for \$300,000 and we
- 9 ended up doing it for \$32,000. So, you know, you really
- 10 have to look at the options.
- 11 This is four levels of districts. I
- 12 think, Doug, what did you charge for Arizona? Was it
- 13 1.5 something? 2.4 million for Arizona. So, you know,
- 14 this is Arizona. This is California. So I think now
- 15 hearing \$300,000, that may be a little on the lower end.
- 16 That may be one stab at a district, comparing it to
- 17 that. You know, you really have to weigh it. So just
- 18 throwing out a number I don't think makes a lot of
- 19 sense.
- 20 I usually bid by hourly rate. That's
- 21 what I've done before. That may also not be a good way
- 22 to go for you because when you have to go for your
- 23 augmentation to legislature it might be best to have
- 24 just a ballpark figure. And when people do ballparks
- 25 they usually overbid because they don't want to end up

- 1 working for 25 cents an hour. So all of these things
- 2 have to be factored in. So it's not that
- 3 straightforward. That's all I think I can add to this
- 4 at this moment.
- 5 CHAIRMAN WARD: Seeing no one else approach
- 6 the podium, Mr. Claypool?
- 7 MR. CLAYPOOL: Just I want to make one
- 8 comment. I had considered an RFI, what Mr. Johnson has
- 9 considered. Remember, if we do an RFI, request for
- 10 information, that usually structures the RFP. You get
- 11 that information. You say, okay, now we know what we
- 12 want, and so now we're going to go out for a proposal.
- 13 If we do the RFI and work off of that, you're still sole
- 14 sourcing when we move on. It's not -- an RFI is not, is
- 15 not a bid. That's just information. So as far as the
- 16 Department of General Services is concerned, once we get
- 17 that information and you select, you're still doing a
- 18 sole source contract.
- 19 COMMISSIONER DAI: So, Mr. Claypool, if I
- 20 understand you correctly, we would have to actually do
- 21 an RFP in order to avoid the sole source?
- MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes.
- COMMISSIONER DAI: And, in your opinion,
- 24 although we've received a fair amount of information
- 25 from the work that Ms. Mac Donald has done already to

- 1 outline this nine-region approach, that that would still
- 2 take more than two days to put into an RFP that we would
- 3 be able to evaluate.
- 4 MR. CLAYPOOL: I believe that we can write
- 5 that RFP over a two- to three-day period. Then we have
- 6 to post it, and we have to start drawing the bids, and
- 7 we have to give it a timeline. During that same period
- 8 of time, to answer Commissioner Filkins Webber's
- 9 request, we can ask that we let it for a lesser period,
- 10 although when you let it for a lesser period you're
- 11 always subject, then, to comments from people that you
- 12 didn't give them enough time.
- Now, I have heard and respect
- 14 Commissioner Ancheta's belief that it's a small
- 15 community, and it's the same thing we've heard from
- 16 Mr. Douglas, so I believe that this small community is
- 17 paying attention. So we would expect that if we had a
- 18 smaller timeframe that they would meet that timeframe.
- 19 Then we bring it back in. Now we have to make that
- 20 comparison. We can make it as staff and we can work
- 21 through counsel, but it's got to run back up through
- 22 you. If we have that back in time to do it, we can --
- 23 well, no, we have to have the second meeting because we
- 24 are not noticed for the review of an RFP as of our
- 25 meeting in Sacramento. So we are automatically out to

- 1 that other deadline.
- 2 COMMISSIONER DAI: Ms. Future Chair, if we can
- 3 amend that? We have adequate time to do fourteen days'
- 4 notice?
- 5 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Barabba?
- 6 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I've learned to listen
- 7 to this Commission on several occasions and usually come
- 8 out with a different opinion.
- 9 Based on everything I've heard, it sounds
- 10 to me like we're going to end up taking a risk, no
- 11 matter what we do. And on one side the risk is we're
- 12 going to be delayed because of the process we would have
- 13 to go through. On the other side the risk is we're
- 14 going to be criticized by taking an action that allows
- 15 us to move faster.
- 16 From my own point of view, I'd rather be
- 17 criticized for moving faster and taking that risk.
- 18 Because if anything this Commission is going to be
- 19 facing in the near future is not enough time. And if
- 20 I'm going to be criticized, it's going to be because I
- 21 was ready to take the risk of moving faster.
- 22 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'd like to
- 23 note for the Commission that agendized for the February
- 24 24th and 25th business meeting we do have an item on the
- 25 agenda for recruiting and hiring, including training

- 1 criteria, interviewing, and choosing staff and
- 2 consultants. Can counsel clarify if that would be a
- 3 sufficient agenda item to allow us the flexibility to
- 4 deal with this in Sacramento.
- 5 MR. MILLER: I think the phrase "choosing
- 6 consultants" would give us a basis for making that
- 7 deci si on.
- 8 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Yao?
- 9 COMMISSIONER YAO: I want to thank you for
- 10 giving me a chance to kind of work this issue out in my
- 11 mind. I think, based on the public comment, I kind of
- 12 bracket this cost that we're committing to about a
- 13 half-a-million-dollar type of number, even though it's
- 14 not a firm quote; it's not a binding number. So on that
- 15 basis, and we clearly need a map drawer, and if I voted
- 16 against this then clearly we would be putting our
- 17 schedule in serious jeopardy. So at this point in time
- 18 I'm inclined to support the sole source to Karin and
- 19 proceed with the project in that manner.
- 20 CHAIRMAN WARD: I'd just like to share a
- 21 comment, too. I was really torn with this, and I shared
- 22 the Commission's feelings and great debate on a very
- 23 important issue. I think that there is going to be a
- 24 lot of scrutiny going with a sole source contract;
- 25 there's no question about that. But the decision before

- 1 us leaves us at the same place: sole source contract.
- 2 And I think that the last bit of public
- 3 comment I heard has really helped clear some things up
- 4 for me as far as, if what's being asked for is a press
- 5 release from a small community, certainly there's enough
- 6 avenues for reaching the Commission and providing input
- 7 without the press release. So I guess I feel like if
- 8 there's ample opportunity to be involved and submit, you
- 9 know, proposals, ideas, things like that, if -- and I
- 10 just -- I don't feel like putting out a press release
- and waiting the extra time at the risk of losing
- 12 valuable, valuable time gains us much. So I think that
- 13 I, too, agree and would be in support of the motion on
- 14 the floor.
- 15 COMMISSIONER DAI: I just want to clarify that
- 16 I don't think it's a choice between a sole source and a
- 17 sole source. It's a choice between a sole source and a
- 18 competitive bid. If we were able to put out an RFP it
- 19 would be in fact a competitive bid.
- 20 CHAIRMAN WARD: I stand corrected. I was
- 21 referring to the idea of not doing the RFP but just
- 22 simply noticing the information without a formal RFP, as
- 23 was also suggested through public comment.
- 24 COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay.
- 25 COMMISSIONER YAO: Call for the question? We

- 1 need somebody to second that motion.
- 2 COMMISSIONER DAI: So with the Commission's
- 3 dispensation I would like to just make one final
- 4 comment, and then maybe -- I know some other
- 5 commissioners are sitting with this as well.
- 6 I do think from an -- I was trying to
- 7 show through these questions that it was possible for us
- 8 to do a competitive bid within this time, and we've
- 9 established that in fact it would not delay our
- 10 decision-making, assuming that people were able to
- 11 respond to the bid in time for our next meeting and it
- 12 is in fact properly noticed. So I guess I'm having a
- 13 hard time understanding why we wouldn't just ask the
- 14 question. Because, as has been pointed out, we haven't
- 15 asked for proposals, and all I'm suggesting is that we
- 16 do ask so that we do have choices.
- 17 CHAIRMAN WARD: Any further comment?
- 18 Commissioner Raya?
- 19 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Well, not to keep beating
- 20 this, but I do intend to vote against this motion for
- 21 the reasons that Cynthia has expressed. I just haven't
- jumped back into it because I think there's been quite a
- 23 bit said, but I'm going to stick with what I think is
- the responsible decision for me.
- 25 CHAIRMAN WARD: At this point we have a motion

- 1 on the floor. It's been seconded.
- A point of order. Well, let's open it
- 3 back up for public comment one last time specifically
- 4 regarding the motion on the floor.
- 5 COMMISSIONER DAI: To clarify, is the motion
- 6 on the floor to call the question?
- 7 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Yes, the
- 8 question's called.
- 9 CHAIRMAN WARD: Let's vote.
- 10 MS. SARGIS: I just need a clarification on
- 11 who seconded the original motion.
- 12 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I did.
- 13 MS. SARGIS: It thought so. Thank you.
- 14 CHAIRMAN WARD: Can we have the motion
- 15 rephrased from either Janeece or the court reporter.
- MS. SARGIS: I believe the motion is to enter
- 17 into a sole source contract with Q2 Data Research for
- 18 line drawing, educational workshops, and input hearings.
- 19 CHAI RMAN WARD: Thank you.
- 20 All in favor of the motion on the floor,
- 21 rai se your hand and say "Yes."
- 22 COMMISSION MEMBERS: Yes.
- 23 CHAIRMAN WARD: All against? Opposed?
- 24 COMMISSION MEMBERS: No.
- 25 CHAIRMAN WARD: Let's go ahead and do a roll

- 1 call. We'll do a roll call vote.
- 2 MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Aguirre?
- 3 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: I must once again
- 4 mention that perhaps we could change the order of this.
- 5 But -- perhaps starting with Mr. Yao. But, yes, I am in
- 6 support of the motion. I feel that we need to move
- 7 forward, so let's go.
- 8 MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Ancheta?
- 9 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: No.
- 10 MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Barabba?
- 11 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes.
- 12 MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Blanco?
- 13 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Abstain.
- 14 MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Dai?
- 15 COMMISSIONER DAI: No.
- 16 MS. SARGIS: Commissioner DiGuilio?
- 17 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Yes.
- 18 MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Filkins Webber?
- 19 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: No.
- 20 MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Forbes?
- 21 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.
- 22 MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Galambos Malloy?
- 23 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: No.
- MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Ontai?
- 25 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: Aye.

1 MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Parvenu? 2 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: In adherence to the 3 recommendation of the technical advisory committee, my 4 answer is yes. 5 Commissioner Raya? MS. SARGIS: COMMISSIONER RAYA: 6 No. 7 MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Ward? 8 CHAIRMAN WARD: Yes. 9 MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Yao? 10 COMMISSIONER YAO: Yes. 11 MS. SARGIS: Eight yes's, five no's, one 12 abstain. 13 CHAIRMAN WARD: Very good. 14 Kirk? 15 MR. MILLER: I am checking the rules as we 16 speak to determine if nine is needed for a motion of 17 this type or only for other special types of motions, 18 and I've not found that provision. Does anyone happen 19 to remember that of the lawyers that are here? 20 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah. I don't have the 21 number but I believe the minimum vote is nine for any 22 motion, where some require a supermajority by sub-pool, 23 which is also nine, but by sub-pool. Is that correct, 24 Commissioner Filkins Webber? Is that what you recall? 25 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: As I recall,

- 1 yes.
- 2 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: That's what I recall as
- 3 well. I looked at the stuff last night, so I think
- 4 that's it.
- 5 MR. MILLER: Well, I can report back rather
- 6 than --
- 7 MR. CLAYPOOL: Can we take a small break?
- 8 CHAIRMAN WARD: Take a five-minute break.
- 9 Adjourn in five minutes.
- 10 (Recess from 5: 14 p.m. to 5: 24 p.m.)
- 11 CHAIRMAN WARD: Re-adjourn, back to the
- 12 Citizens Redistricting Commission, and I yield the mike
- 13 to the Vice.
- 14 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'd like to
- 15 make a motion coming out of that last vote that
- 16 hopefully will compromise I think some of the issues
- 17 that have been on the table that have left us --
- 18 COMMISSIONER YAO: Did the last motion pass or
- 19 fail?
- 20 MR. MILLER: Yeah, if I could -- and thank you
- 21 for giving me a moment to look at the statute. And
- there are two rules helpful to the Commission going
- 23 forward. First, with respect to any motion before the
- 24 Commission, a vote of nine is required. Secondly, for
- 25 retaining consultants, that does fit into the special

- 1 rule, which is nine votes and a requirement of three
- 2 votes from each of the parties of the nonaligned
- 3 commissioners.
- 4 CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you, Kirk.
- 5 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: So my motion
- 6 that I would like to put out for consideration is to
- 7 enter into a contract with Karin with Q2 Research & Data
- 8 to do only the educational meetings and community
- 9 workshops as specified in that first push of what we
- 10 need to make happen, so something that strikes a balance
- 11 between the interest that we need to get out the gate
- 12 and get moving, and at the same time we really want to
- 13 make sure we have a robust public process around any
- 14 large bids that we do.
- So we move ahead with the contract on the
- 16 educational meetings and workshops and, I would suggest,
- 17 with the first statewide input hearing. Then we put up
- 18 an RFP for the remainder of the technical support, the
- 19 remainder of the outreach and input meetings, and go
- 20 through that RFP process. We could set a special
- 21 meeting at which time we can review whatever proposals
- 22 that we come back to.
- That's my motion. I wonder before even
- seeing if there's a second does Dan have any comment on
- 25 that.

- 1 MR. CLAYPOOL: I'll second it, only that that
- 2 amount will exceed my procurement authority and
- 3 therefore you understand will be a sole source contract
- 4 for those services.
- 5 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And when you
- 6 say "that amount" you mean the amount necessary for the
- 7 educational meetings and that first statewide meeting.
- 8 MR. CLAYPOOL: Right. I believe when Karin
- 9 said \$3,000, I think that that figure, in my mind -- and
- 10 someone can correct me -- I believe that figure was the
- 11 cost of the centers. I didn't hear that as necessarily
- 12 being the cost of all her services. So if we're talking
- 13 about taking all those meetings and the travel and so
- 14 forth, I believe that that will exceed the \$4,999
- 15 procurement level that I can make without having the
- 16 approval of DGS for this thing.
- 17 So that's the only caveat in there, is
- 18 that we would have to have her submit a bid and then we
- 19 would have to take that forward for sole source on the
- 20 basis that for that component we don't have enough time
- 21 to let a contract with someone else through the RFP
- 22 process.
- 23 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Just a question of
- 24 clarification. Regarding Karin's participation in the
- 25 educational workshop component of the project, as I

- 1 understood it from her presentation and from I think my
- 2 discussion with -- our discussion with CCP is that her
- 3 participation would be in crafting the data capture --
- 4 no, that's not true. Her participation would be in
- 5 outlining the type of information and the documents
- 6 that -- and the information that CCP would need to go
- 7 out and actually do the training, which is the
- 8 educational aspect of the workshops, and not only
- 9 informing the public about redistricting but also in how
- 10 they can submit information to the Commission. Strictly
- 11 educational.
- 12 So my understanding of Karin's part in
- 13 this, again, to reiterate, is that she would just be
- 14 working with that consultant to set up the parameters
- 15 for the type of information, the type of data that is
- 16 going to be captured. So in that sense, then, it does
- 17 not really require her to be present, or any of her
- 18 staff to be present, as I think will be elucidated by
- 19 the outreach consultant in our next presentation. So in
- 20 that regard, then, I'm not sure whether that would cost
- 21 \$49, 999.
- 22 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: I think to clarify,
- 23 too, that the services that Q2 would provide would be
- 24 the content for the educational -- the technical content
- 25 for those educational meetings, which would then be

- 1 implemented by CCP. And correct me if I'm wrong. I
- 2 thought I heard you say both the educational workshops
- 3 and the input hearings? Was that part of the motion, or
- 4 just the educational?
- 5 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Educational
- 6 workshops and my suggestion was the first statewide. I
- 7 believe in these documents it's called input hearings.
- 8 Which is basically what we've noticed in Sacramento.
- 9 That would be the civic engagement, the portion where
- 10 statewide organizations and interested parties can come
- and present to the Commission regarding their feedback
- 12 on the overall process. So to have the contracting for
- 13 educational purposes and that one statewide meeting in
- 14 the first part of our three-phase process that we agreed
- 15 to.
- 16 CHAIRMAN WARD: So we have a motion on the
- 17 floor and it's been seconded. Commissioner Ontai?
- 18 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: I'm still a little
- 19 confused on this. Could I ask either Sarah or Charlotte
- 20 and Karin to come up and tell us exactly what's going to
- 21 happen between the two of you during this educational
- 22 process.
- 23 CHAIRMAN WARD: Actually if I can make a
- 24 point. I'm sorry. Can I ask you to withdraw your
- 25 motion at this time for reconsideration.

- 1 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I am being
- 2 asked to withdraw my motion for reconsideration at
- 3 another time in order that our guests may make their
- 4 presentation, given the lateness of the hour.
- 5 CHAIRMAN WARD: When I was informed -- I was
- 6 informed this was ready to go, but it looks like it's
- 7 going to require some discussion, and we have presenters
- 8 waiting that have been promised that they would have
- 9 their time this evening. So I'd like to invite them
- 10 forward at this time to make their presentation.
- 11 MS. RUBIN: Good afternoon, evening. Hi, I'm
- 12 Sarah Rubin, and I'm with the Center for Collaborative
- 13 Policy.
- 14 You should have in front of you four
- 15 different handouts. And for those who might still be
- 16 watching on the webcast, these documents have actually
- 17 been uploaded to the redistricting.ca.org website, if
- 18 anybody wants to follow along. Three of them are up.
- 19 Www. redistricting. ca. org.
- 20 And this is my colleague.
- 21 MS. CHORNEAU: Hi, I'm Charlotte Chorneau,
- 22 facilitator/mediator with the Center For Collaborative
- 23 Policy.
- MS. RUBIN: So the four things you should have
- in front of you. First I'm going to go over the

- 1 PowerPoint, but the other three items are the full
- 2 proposal. You'll see the CSUS logo in the top left
- 3 corner. That's the narrative version of the PowerPoint.
- 4 Next you've got a table. This is a full, detailed
- 5 budget which we're kind of thinking of this as a menu.
- 6 It's got costed-out options for all the different things
- 7 you've been talking about all day, and we'll go over
- 8 that.
- 9 And then the fourth item, this is the
- 10 only one that isn't on the redistricting website. This
- 11 is a draft scope of work so that if you would like us to
- 12 help you prepare for the February 26th outreach session,
- 13 this would be a proposal just for work from February
- 14 11th through February 26th.
- 15 And then the big one with the multiple
- 16 pages with the table, this is the proposal for a full
- 17 outreach strategy. Because we're assuming, since you're
- 18 just seeing it now, you're going to want to take public
- 19 comment and you're going to want people to be able to
- 20 comment on this over the next couple weeks.
- 21 And then also at the end of the
- 22 presentation we're going to be looking if you would like
- 23 to move forward with some kind of proposal for your
- 24 specific direction on exactly what you want so we can
- 25 have a completely refined number for you on February 26.

- 1 Is that all -- are you with me so far?
- 2 All right. So let's go to the next
- 3 slide. All right. So a little bit about the Center for
- 4 Collaborative Policy. The Center has extensive
- 5 experience in civic engagement, multi-party consensus
- 6 building, and strategic planning with local, state and
- 7 federal agencies as well as non-profits. We are a
- 8 self-supporting unit of the College of Social Sciences
- 9 and Interdisciplinary Studies at CSU Sacramento. Our
- 10 mission is to build the capacity of public agencies,
- 11 stakeholder groups, and the public to use collaborative
- 12 strategies to improve policy outcomes. We've got three
- 13 emphases: service, teaching and research.
- 14 So this has kind of been talked about all
- 15 day, but just to completely clarify. What you're
- 16 considering is doing an interagency agreement with us
- 17 for this work. So, as you know, a couple Fridays ago
- 18 you asked us to put together an outreach strategy
- 19 proposal, and as we did that over the last couple weeks
- 20 we held some guiding principles in mind. We just wanted
- 21 to review these. Most of them are things you've kind of
- 22 referenced throughout your meeting today.
- The first is meet people where they're
- 24 at. We feel like this is very important because
- 25 there's -- I think Kathay mentioned it earlier today.

- 1 There are some people who are following this all the
- 2 time. There's others who will get involved over the
- 3 next couple months. But we can't assume that folks --
- 4 folks might not be interested until June or July when
- 5 they see a new iteration of the maps and they realize,
- 6 "Oh, this is going to affect me." So we need to be
- 7 ready for people coming at this process at any time with
- 8 all different levels of knowledge.
- 9 Leverage. We want to reach out and work
- 10 with the network groups, but given the position of the
- 11 Commission, you always want to balance that with
- 12 perceptions of neutrality. So that's something we're
- 13 always thinking about.
- 14 And then we definitely want all our
- 15 efforts in sync. So whoever your technical expert is,
- 16 we need to work very closely with them. We'll of course
- 17 be working very closely with Mr. Wilcox, your
- 18 communications director.
- 19 And continually test assumptions. So we
- 20 always encourage that, whatever you're doing, you're
- 21 thinking through how might others perceive this. We're
- 22 always coming from always have the best intentions, and
- 23 I'm assuming you all would, too. We always want to
- 24 question ourselves. How might others see this? What
- 25 might we not be thinking of? So just taking the time to

- 1 do that.
- 2 And then seeking quality over quantity.
- 3 Planning is always time well spent.
- 4 Use existing networks to broadcast
- 5 messages.
- 6 Trusted messengers. And I think this is
- 7 another one you've already talked about quite a bit
- 8 today.
- 9 And finally accommodate different
- 10 learning styles. For some people it's seeing it on the
- 11 PowerPoint. For some people it's making notes on your
- 12 handouts, or listening. Everyone learns differently.
- 13 And you want to hit people as many ways as possible so
- 14 they can really take in the information, especially
- 15 since this topic is quite complex and it's not something
- 16 people are necessarily familiar with. It's new to them.
- 17 Okay. This is a high-level overview of
- 18 our proposal. We're in the middle, civic engagement
- 19 facilitators, and we would be coordinating with your
- 20 different consultants, technical experts, communication
- 21 strategy of your communications director.
- 22 And then earlier it was referenced, and
- 23 we'll get a little deeper into, commissioner-initiated
- 24 outreach, so times where you might go out and visit a
- 25 place. It isn't feasible to do a big public meeting.

- 1 Say you're going on the radio or interviewing with
- 2 ethnic media, for example.
- 3 And then of course we would be
- 4 implementing the public outreach.
- 5 MS. CHORNEAU: And this slide is showing how
- 6 it's going to take a major project management role to
- 7 make the trains run throughout the next few months if
- 8 you're going to do a big outreach process. So you need
- 9 someone who is coordinating everything and making sure
- 10 everyone is on the same page.
- 11 MS. RUBIN: Proposed timeline. You've already
- seen this maybe in some different iterations from
- 13 different folks. You've got your first -- we know
- 14 you're doing an initial outreach meeting February 26.
- 15 We've got February out there. The idea is that
- 16 community workshops would happen in March. And we think
- 17 that even though people would like to have them all in
- 18 March, we think you probably can't accomplish that. You
- 19 might have to have some the beginning of April. And
- then your public hearings would happen all through
- 21 August.
- 22 And then down here we've got the
- 23 Commission-initiated educational outreach, which we
- 24 would encourage you to go wherever -- we've heard from
- you over the meetings everyone really wants to get out

- 1 there, and we would encourage you to do that.
- 2 MS. CHORNEAU: So we'll just take a minute to
- 3 kind of explain how we put this proposal together and
- 4 some of the steps that we are recommending you need to
- 5 initiate right up front. So whenever we do a process
- 6 design it's a best practice of ours to talk to people
- 7 who are already on the ground and engaging in the
- 8 subject. So we never do a process design in a vacuum or
- 9 assuming that we know what other people are doing. We
- 10 actually talk to them.
- 11 So we started making some informal calls,
- 12 informal assessments, talking to some groups that are
- 13 really well known and engaged on this subject, seeing
- 14 what their expectations are for the Commission's
- 15 engagement effort, seeing what they would like to see,
- 16 asking them what would be most helpful, where are the
- 17 gaps, where would you fill in those gaps.
- 18 So those are the kinds of questions we
- 19 were asking, and that was what was informing our
- 20 process, also keeping in mind our own expertise in doing
- 21 these types of really large-scale outreach efforts. But
- 22 that was informal and that was time-compressed. We
- 23 would recommend doing a broader assessment, at least an
- 24 online survey or something that would be open to anyone
- who would like to give input.

1 It's really important to not shut any 2 doors and allow anyone who would like to give input. 3 That's actually one of the things that is on your 4 from-now-to-February-26 scope of work. If you were to 5 ask us to do it we could draft an assessment and put it 6 up on like a survey monkey or blog or something like 7 that. 8 The next thing is your communications 9 assessment. And when Sarah went over the guiding 10 principles a moment ago she said one of them was to 11 always leverage existing networks, on-the-ground 12 networks, groups that are already engaged and know who 13 are community organizers. We would never want to 14 recreate that wheel. We would want to identify those 15 people and start building that list serve, call it that 16 now, so that when you're ready to start holding meetings 17 you can just press, you know, the send button and you 18 already know the people that you need to connect with. 19 So that's our communication assessment 20 and that also needs to start right away. 21 The next thing here is February 26 public 22 We felt and we advised that use that day to --23 rather than open it up to -- and I know you can't limit 24 the focus, but at least you can be proactive about what 25 the focus is, and that would be to invite those types of

- 1 statewide groups that are already doing outreach and
- 2 allow them time to give presentations on what they're
- 3 doing, structured presentations, so that they're all
- 4 answering the same kinds of questions, that you're
- 5 getting that information back, the same kinds of things
- 6 that we've been talking to them about in our assessment,
- 7 but then you can get that information directly from
- 8 them.
- 9 So just mention these are, again, all
- 10 things you guys have been talking about today, so we'll
- 11 go kind of quickly through them so we can get through
- 12 everything today.
- The toolkit, which is our first
- 14 component, if you think of it like this, you need to --
- 15 so a couple people today have talked about materials and
- 16 how to develop them. One thing would be your own type
- 17 of guidelines or worksheet of how you like to structure
- 18 input coming from the community in a hearing to you.
- 19 It's really important to have that type of structure.
- 20 It can create -- if everyone's coming up and doing their
- 21 testimony in different ways it's really hard to organize
- 22 that on the other end. So we would recommend that you
- 23 do a worksheet or some sort of guidelines, and that
- 24 would become the core of your toolkit. You would want
- 25 to get that out to people in enough time to prepare

- 1 their testimony, et cetera.
- 2 You'd also want to have educational
- 3 materials, possibly like Kathay from Common Cause
- 4 mentioned earlier, which is exactly what we would
- 5 mention, is take all the materials that are already out
- 6 there, work with them, that they've already done the
- 7 work, and just kind of reformat it, maybe change the
- 8 tone or the branding, but at least you don't have to
- 9 recreate that wheel. But you do want to put that
- 10 information out there.
- 11 MS. RUBIN: I was just going to add on that
- 12 another thing we heard in our informal phone calls is
- 13 that folks out there would really like clarity on
- 14 exactly what you want. And once they understand what
- 15 you want and how that is going to be in your data
- 16 rollout, it will really help them organize and
- 17 communicate to their own constituencies. So no matter
- 18 who does this, it's of absolute importance. It's going
- 19 to make it so much easier for you when it's time to call
- 20 up that data.
- 21 MS. CHORNEAU: So we've been talking about
- 22 community workshops or educational workshops. They can
- 23 be done in different formats. And so if you think of
- 24 everything that I'm talking about now as kind of the
- 25 menu, there are a lot of different options to achieving

- 1 these objectives. But this objective is the educational
- 2 component to this, something that you want to start
- 3 early on. You want to get that toolkit out there. You
- 4 want to start bringing people together, at least provide
- 5 the option for people that are not engaged yet, for
- 6 whatever reason, to come to a regional community
- 7 workshop and start becoming engaged.
- 8 There are many groups that are already
- 9 doing this on the ground, and there might be people that
- 10 are only paying attention to what the Commission is
- 11 doing. There might be people that don't feel
- 12 comfortable, for whatever reason, going to one of the
- 13 meetings that is already taking place. So this is just
- 14 an opportunity for you to hold your own.
- There are many different formats, and I
- 16 know that in our text here in the full process design we
- 17 are recommending that you videotape the first one, put
- 18 that on the web, have it available in a different
- 19 format, and you can mix and match. We were working with
- 20 Karin so we were working off of a seven -- an assumption
- of possibly seven that you could do. You know, you
- 22 could redesign it and retool it so that it fits your
- 23 budget or your objectives, but we do think that at least
- 24 doing some sort of outreach in the educational is really
- 25 important.

1 This was an idea that we had to carry that 2 same theme throughout the whole process. So if you do 3 seven community workshops and they end in the middle of 4 April, we are recommending that you could do a 5 prehearing educational session. So say your hearing 6 starts at 10:00. You open the doors at 8:00 and you 7 have those materials there. You have staff there that 8 People can come two hours can answer some questions. 9 early and get themselves organized in case they haven't 10 been involved before. It's very valuable time and it's 11 time well spent. 12 The other thing is people might just not know 13 how the hearing is going to go, and that's another 14 opportunity to explain the structure of the meeting, the 15 agenda, so that they feel more comfortable. 16 The public hearings, we do recommend --17 statutorily you have to hold these types of hearings. 18 That doesn't mean you can't have any structure around 19 That doesn't mean you can't educate people before them. 20 the hearings, comment about what to expect that day, 21 which is what you would do in your educational sessions. 22 So we would definitely advise you doing a design and a 23 structure and getting that out there as soon as possible 24 so people know exactly how to present that day and what 25 to expect.

1	MS. RUBIN: Just so that you can start
2	thinking about this step, one of the things that we've
3	been thinking about is just, for example, today I think
4	you heard from somebody who had a public comment: It's
5	hard to know when they're supposed to come about a given
6	subject. You know, you can comment now but only on this
7	motion. So people are thinking, "I have something to
8	share. When do I share it?" And our experience is that
9	if you know when you're going on you don't mind waiting.
10	It's kind of like the bus. Like if you know the bus is
11	coming in six minutes you don't mind waiting six
12	minutes. But when you have no idea if it's two minutes
13	or fifteen, that's when you start to feel anxious.
14	So the more that we can do to set up the
15	public hearing. So, for example, one idea we've talked
16	about is kind of like the when you go to the deli and
17	you take a ticket, or at the meat counter, and you wait
18	for your number to be called. Can you set up anything
19	that will help people understand when they are going to
20	go up to testify. So if I'm on number 17 and I'm number
21	56, I know it's quite a while until I'm going to need to
22	testify. So if I want to step outside the room and get
23	a drink or call and check on someone. Or, you know, if
24	you're going to hold these on Saturdays a lot of people
25	are going to come with their kids, so maybe they want to

- 1 step outside and play with their children and come back
- 2 in.
- Thank you.
- 4 MS. CHORNEAU: Commissioner-initiated
- 5 educational outreach. We heard at the last meeting, you
- 6 articulated a need to go to places where -- you know,
- 7 your arms can only extend so far, given the budget and
- 8 the time. And there might be places that you as
- 9 commissioners have a special interest or places that you
- 10 feel are just not getting reached out to enough through
- 11 the formal hearings or the public workshops. And so
- 12 we've talked to the Commission's communications director
- 13 and worked out some way that you could approach this,
- 14 which would be to work with him to get possibly earned
- 15 media educational. It would be one way. But you could
- 16 at least reach out to those areas if you feel they're
- 17 being left out. And that's one suggestion for how you
- 18 could approach that. And that would be throughout the
- 19 process we would encourage you to do that.
- 20 Your online resources. I don't think it
- 21 should come to any surprise that people would like your
- 22 website to be really user-friendly. It should probably
- 23 be a dot.org so that it can more interactive and you can
- 24 do more with that than you can with a statewide site.
- 25 You would need to contract probably with a webmaster and

- 1 have somebody coordinating with that. These are just
- 2 some examples of things that you should probably have on
- 3 your website. Something we definitely heard from the
- 4 community, as we're talking to them, is a calendar. And
- 5 if there's any way to make it interactive so that they
- 6 can put their own dates on there and share those dates,
- 7 broadcast them, it would be a great added value.
- 8 You can also use that as a place to hold
- 9 your toolkit. It also creates a lot of transparency.
- 10 You can hold your video stream and all of that.
- And also we are assuming that there would
- 12 be a way to upload testimony directly to the website.
- 13 So if someone comes to an educational workshop and gets
- 14 all that information and wants to go home and do it at
- 15 home with their community, they don't have to come back
- 16 to a formal hearing. As long as you broadcast that
- 17 option out there, people will use it.
- MS. RUBIN: I just want to add in on the
- 19 importance of that, is when you're talking about the
- 20 number of hearings you can hold and coming back to this
- 21 part of an area or that part of an area, we all know,
- 22 depending on where you're talking about, either because
- 23 of the literal geographic distance or traffic because of
- 24 where you are, say you hold a hearing for your first
- 25 hearing and then you're going to move somewhere else, it

- 1 just might not be realistic for folks to come back
- 2 because it would be just too much travel time.
- 3 MS. CHORNEAU: This is actually something that
- 4 hasn't been talked about yet, and it's a conference call
- 5 webinar option, another thing in lieu of an actual
- 6 in-person hearing, which are very expensive. There are
- 7 a whole lot of people who aren't going to be able to
- 8 participate in person for whatever reason, whether
- 9 they're working full-time, or they live in remote areas,
- 10 they're just too busy to come on a Saturday. This is a
- 11 great and very inexpensive way to hold educational
- 12 workshops on the phone.
- 13 I don't know if you're all familiar with
- 14 the webinar type of software Where you can show your
- 15 screens to anyone that clicks on the link. You can just
- 16 follow along that way. We would definitely recommend at
- 17 least holding one or two of these. If you're going to
- 18 do any sort of educational workshops you'll capture a
- 19 | lot more people doing that.
- 20 Phone access. Just you should have a
- 21 phone that people can call. Not everyone is on the web.
- MS. RUBIN: So here we're just reiterating the
- 23 different roles and the responsibilities. And, from
- 24 where we sit, we would be working with everyone you see
- 25 here. Obviously we would be the civic engagement

- 1 facilitators. You've got your technical experts,
- 2 coordinating logistics, working with the communications
- 3 director, the webmaster you end up bringing on, and then
- 4 translation and interpretation, and of course with your
- 5 staff.
- 6 And then here's a different view of what
- 7 we've been talking about, just coming back up to the
- 8 high-level view. So you see here on the right all the
- 9 things that we've talked about as far as what we're
- 10 thinking of as your menu, your components, and now you
- 11 need to decide what you want your outreach strategy to
- 12 look like so that we could -- if you want us to help you
- 13 refine some kind of plan.
- So hearings with possibly a prehearing
- 15 educational element, community workshops, conference
- 16 calls, which could also include webinar, online
- 17 resources, and some kind of phone access.
- 18 MS. CHORNEAU: Just because there are a lot of
- 19 different moving pieces. And I know you guys are tired,
- 20 as I think we all are at this time of day. I wanted to
- 21 explain just a little bit about how we would work with
- 22 the other groups specifically. For example, when you're
- 23 creating a toolkit, like the materials, Sarah and I, our
- organization is content-neutral. We do not create
- 25 content. What we would do is we would work with your

- 1 technical experts to create the content. We would work
- 2 with your staff for their input, and then we to put it
- 3 all together.
- 4 And our input is more on process. So
- 5 it's like if you ask a question you should have lines so
- 6 people can actually write it in, you know, those types
- 7 of things. Or if you word it in this way people might
- 8 understand it better. And we'll help you formulate
- 9 that. So that's just one example of how we would work
- 10 together.
- 11 MS. RUBIN: And as we start to go into the
- 12 budget now you'll see we have time in there to
- 13 coordinate those efforts. And then we have time in so
- 14 that, once you have your basic materials, if you wanted
- 15 us to, we would work with your translators to get all
- 16 your materials translated, to get everything done so you
- 17 have everything in place, so wherever you go you have
- 18 everything you need.
- 19 Any questions on this before we start
- 20 going into the budget? No. Okay.
- 21 So the next sheet, if you could pull out,
- 22 it's the big table, has "draft" written in large
- 23 letters. So what we have here -- I think Charlotte,
- 24 she's going to pull it up on the screen. So what we
- 25 have here is we're trying to show you specific numbers

- 1 around our estimate of what it would take for labor to
- 2 implement what we've just been talking about.
- 3 So we've got the labor rates on the left,
- 4 the task or activity in the next column, our estimated
- 5 hours, so either per week or for your whole process or
- 6 month, depending on what it is, the total number of
- 7 hours, and then an explanation of what this involves.
- 8 So if it's six hours it's like what are you doing for
- 9 those six hours. That's the explanation on the right.
- 10 So what I can do is let me give you a
- 11 choice. I can either run through this just pretty
- 12 slowly page by page. I can tell you what's on each page
- 13 and you can take a couple minutes to look through it and
- 14 then we can do questions. It's a lot of information.
- 15 What would you prefer?
- 16 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: Can you do a summary and
- 17 then we can open it up to more details?
- 18 MS. RUBIN: Sure. On the first page what
- 19 you're looking at is base costs. So just as
- 20 Mr. Claypool was talking about earlier, you don't know
- 21 exactly how much money you're going to have because of
- 22 the way you're going to the legislature, so we have
- 23 divided this up with the thought of here's the absolute
- 24 minimum you can do to move forward whatsoever. And then
- 25 after that here are all the different components, what

- 1 they cost. And then we're going to give you
- 2 multipliers. So we'll be looking at how much something
- 3 one time costs, and then that way if you want to
- 4 multiply it by nine or eighteen or thirty-six it's up to
- 5 you.
- 6 So here's our baseline costs. First we
- 7 have coordination with the webmaster. We assume that
- 8 would be ongoing, an average of six hours a week. We're
- 9 looking at this as 22 weeks from March 1st through the
- 10 end of July is the timeframe that we're looking at here.
- 11 So we know that it would be more at the beginning, so
- 12 this is an average.
- Then the toolkit. We have a blog
- 14 estimate, newsletter, surveys, pod-casts. These are all
- 15 examples. You can pick and choose, because we had the
- 16 impression you want to know all the different options
- 17 out here. This isn't saying you have to do any of it;
- 18 it's just so you understand.
- 19 Coordinating with the videotaping.
- 20 That's the idea Charlotte brought up earlier, that if
- 21 you wanted to videotape a workshop and then post it on
- 22 the web, that would take some coordination to work with
- 23 whoever was contracted to do that.
- 24 To coordinate with the database the data
- 25 roll-up index issues, we assume that would be about two

- 1 hours a week.
- 2 And then here in the next line, I
- 3 apologize but we didn't realize until we already had
- 4 this printed. I made a big mistake. So I'm going to
- 5 ask you to get out your pen or pencil, and I've got it
- 6 corrected on the one you're seeing on the screen, but
- 7 the one in front of you is wrong, and it's a big wrong
- 8 because it's about a \$76,000 mistake. So it's a
- 9 lot-of-money mistake.
- 10 So here on establish outreach network,
- 11 communication assessment, you on your paper have the
- 12 number 920, and it should be 284. So a very significant
- 13 difference. So I want to make sure you note it because
- 14 it changes all these numbers significantly. And
- 15 apologize. I feel like if we realized how much time we
- 16 had before our presentation I just even could have
- 17 gotten these recopied, but we didn't know.
- So we're estimating here.
- 19 I'm just taking a little time with this
- 20 because I know this is key to what you're looking for.
- 21 20 hours to work on your overarching
- 22 outreach and communication framework. Then an average
- 23 of twelve hours a week for 22 weeks, or another way to
- 24 look at it with your nine-region division of the state
- would be 29 hours per region.

- 1 MS. CHORNEAU: Let me clarify. This is what I
- 2 was talking about earlier, which is finding those touch
- 3 points. I call them grass tops. So rather than going
- 4 all the way to the root you're finding those people that
- 5 can get there for you, but that still takes a lot of
- 6 time and coordination. And then it's also the time you
- 7 would spend getting the information to them and making
- 8 sure they understand and if they have any questions.
- 9 There's time associated with that.
- 10 MS. RUBIN: So then we got process design
- 11 refinement, developing meeting materials, working on the
- 12 graphics, the looks of all your materials. We have an
- 13 in-house graphic person. And then project management.
- 14 That goes back to us being in the center and making sure
- 15 all the parts are moving on time.
- So now is another time for your pencil.
- 17 The total CCP base cost, rather than the
- 18 two-eleven-two-sixty-four you have on your sheet it
- 19 should be 130, 569. \$130, 569. So this is our estimate
- 20 for a base fixed cost. It's kind of to get you started.
- 21 MS. CHORNEAU: Well, that chart is one-time
- 22 cost, so they're not associated with a meeting, so you
- 23 wouldn't have to times them by 18 or something. Those
- 24 are things that we're estimating for just ongoing costs.
- 25 The next chart will show you what it would be for per

- 1 workshop, per hearing.
- 2 MS. RUBIN: And then for the other direct
- 3 costs, for example, included in this when we talk about
- 4 something like your prehearing educational sessions, we
- 5 would want to get a series of poster boards, things that
- 6 fold out so people could be looking at the information
- 7 in different ways. We'd have two sets, one for the
- 8 north half of the state and one for the south.
- 9 So the one-time base cost, the total
- 10 \$134, 944.
- 11 MS. CHORNEAU: And just to clarify again,
- 12 that's if we did all the things on the list, so it would
- 13 be taking the things at the buffet.
- MS. RUBIN: So if you didn't want a blog we'd
- 15 subtract that; didn't want service.
- 16 Okay, any questions on this page before
- 17 we go to the next?
- 18 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: The one-time base cost
- 19 now that it's been adjusted?
- 20 MS. RUBIN: 130,569. Oh, the bottom one, I'm
- 21 sorry. 134, 944.
- 22 Okay, second page.
- Am I going through this too fast or slow?
- 24 Okay.
- So we're on page 2. So this page

- 1 outlines our details, our assumptions and details about
- 2 the workshops. Now, some of this, given what you all
- 3 talked about as far as Karin, these assume -- some of
- 4 these numbers you wouldn't need if you did it in
- 5 conjunction with one of Karin's resource centers
- 6 because, for example, going there would be free. You
- 7 don't have to pay for a space. But we wanted to give
- 8 you the bigger picture so if you didn't have the
- 9 resource center what's it going to cost you.
- 10 Okay, planning team calls, because
- 11 anytime we go anywhere we're going to need to work with
- 12 the local folks. So if it's Karin's center in San Diego
- 13 we need to work with those people to get ready and
- 14 organi zed.
- Travel, we are doing an estimate of six
- 16 hours. And when you see the "2X" that's for two people.
- 17 So we're assuming two folks would go to these workshops.
- 18 And then you see the note on the right. We charge
- 19 halftime for travel, so that's included in the way these
- 20 numbers add up. But we do want you to note that ODCs,
- 21 or, you know, mileage, air flights, whatever, would be
- 22 additional costs. This is only labor in this table.
- 23 Meeting time. We're assuming -- people
- 24 have talked about four-hour workshops or six-hour
- 25 workshops. For the purposes of this, we're assuming a

- 1 six-hour workshop, 1.5 hour setup and a half hour
- 2 breakdown. Four hours for -- so a total of eight for
- 3 two people. To do some kind of follow-up we would
- 4 assume you would want some kind of very high-level
- 5 one-page, three-page summary of what happened at that
- 6 workshop posted up on the web.
- 7 Materials you need to update for
- 8 everyplace you go. It will be a little different.
- 9 And then the next list has to do with
- 10 coordinating, coordinating with your outreach network.
- 11 We assume you probably want photos taken at your
- 12 different workshops that you can post up on your
- 13 websites, coordinating with the online people who do
- 14 online registration, logistics. We're assuming you
- 15 probably in most places will need a translator or
- 16 multiple translators for multiple different languages.
- 17 Coordinating with your mapper or technical folks, and
- 18 then if there's a video team there, and with a trainer.
- 19 So this, there's no mistakes on this
- 20 page. All the numbers are right.
- 21 MS. CHORNEAU: I just wanted to make another
- 22 point. Also for today's purposes these numbers are
- 23 assuming that basically Sarah and I will be doing this,
- 24 so the rates are at that level. We have people on staff
- 25 at lower rates and so, when appropriate, like doing a

- 1 blog entry, we might have someone at a lower rate draft
- 2 that. So keep that in mind, that this was drafted with
- 3 that assumption, that it would be just she and I, and
- 4 that's not really actually how we would work it. So it
- 5 might be -- some things might be higher. Just some
- 6 things. Why would I pay someone that much to post a
- 7 picture? We wouldn't do that.
- 8 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: Go ahead and finish this
- 9 sheet and when you're done I'd like to open it up for
- 10 Commission questions.
- 11 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: On this sheet I think
- 12 you mentioned this includes travel time but not airfare
- 13 and I odgi ng?
- MS. CHORNEAU: Other direct costs, no.
- 15 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: How would you do that?
- MS. RUBIN: Wait, let's go through this. We
- 17 actually have that.
- So beneath the table where it says CCP
- 19 Labor and expense, \$7,592 per workshop. That's for the
- 20 labor. And then we have assumed an average of \$200 in
- 21 travel expenses. So that that's knowing that some of
- 22 them would be -- we basically looked at the nine regions
- 23 and kind of did a back-of-the-napkin of some of these we
- 24 would be driving and some of them we would be flying,
- assuming you can get pretty cheap flights on Southwest,

- 1 for example. That came out to an average of about \$200
- 2 for travel expenses. So we are including the travel and
- 3 the airfare in the numbers that you see at the bottom of
- 4 the page.
- 5 MS. CHORNEAU: I was trying to do the reality.
- 6 But we have staffs that are statewide. So, again, we
- 7 built an estimate in here to give you something to look
- 8 at. But if we were holding one in LA we would of course
- 9 try and have our LA staff be the ones that do it. So
- 10 just keep that in mind.
- 11 MS. RUBIN: Yes. And we want to take this
- 12 moment to introduce one of our staffers who is based in
- 13 southern California. This is Mindy Meyer.
- 14 Okay, we're doing great on time. Any
- 15 questions on this sheet?
- 16 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: My question is
- in regards to down below the actual chart you talk about
- 18 the cost for interpreter services. It includes travel,
- 19 assumes one interpreter per workshop. I would
- 20 anticipate we will have workshops where one interpreter
- 21 is nowhere near what we'll need. Particularly we'll
- 22 interpreters in multiple languages. So I'm wondering if
- 23 you can tell us a little bit if you have had experience
- 24 working in those types of settings.
- MS. RUBIN: Yes, I'm glad you asked the

- 1 question. So let me preface it with I can probably go
- 2 on too long with the details of this, so stop me. I'll
- 3 try to stop in between when it's gotten too much.
- 4 So, ideally, what anybody in the
- 5 situation you're in would want to do is want to have
- 6 simultaneous translation. And if you're not familiar
- 7 with that, the ideal is folks who want to be hearing
- 8 things in their own native language would be wearing a
- 9 headset, and then you would have interpreters who would
- 10 be speaking through a microphone and they would hear it.
- 11 When you work that way you have to have two interpreters
- 12 because it's very hard work and they have to trade off
- 13 every hour. So automatically you're looking at two
- 14 people for each event.
- Then I'm told to do it right those people
- 16 need to be in a soundproof booth, and then they need to
- 17 have like a wire or cord with them. I think it's maybe
- 18 like your interpreter with the way the sound runs into
- 19 her headset so you don't get confused with background
- 20 noise. That is completely cost-prohibitive. We looked
- 21 into it and it would be way over a million dollars to
- 22 try to do that.
- So what we wanted to bring to you is the
- 24 make-work option, which might not be ideal, but what
- 25 we're bringing up is the idea that you would have to

- 1 have some -- either through some kind of registration or
- 2 just some kind of estimate of working with your partners
- 3 on the ground. If you could have some idea of how many
- 4 folks are coming, then you can make some guesstimate of
- 5 how many translators you would want to have come, and
- 6 then you would probably have those people sitting next
- 7 to the translator. We'd have the materials translated
- 8 into their language so they'd have them in front of
- 9 them, and then the translator would be whispering
- 10 consecutively, not simultaneously, what the speaker in
- 11 front is saying. So it wouldn't be ideal.
- 12 And the other thing just I want to note
- is you can't assume people are literate or fully
- 14 literate, so even though we would have the materials in
- 15 a different language, you shouldn't be assuming they can
- 16 read them. Or maybe they can get part of it. And also
- 17 this is technical and complicated.
- 18 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you.
- 19 That's more than enough information. I just wanted to
- 20 make sure you guys have worked with that. Those are the
- 21 type of details I'm sure our subcommittee is more than
- 22 prepared to handle. Thank you.
- MS. CHORNEAU: Yes. And we just, again,
- 24 include the one. It's actually in the middle of the
- 25 range. A Spanish one-day interpreter is a little bit

- 1 less and then other languages are more. So the \$750 is
- 2 kind of right in the middle. And then that way you've
- 3 got the figure for one so you can kind of always
- 4 multiply it and see what that would be.
- 5 MS. RUBIN: And when we did a quick analysis
- 6 of the state and the region I think in a lot of places
- 7 you could probably need two or three languages, but we
- 8 didn't want to go too deep and overwhelm you today.
- 9 Okay, should I move -- other questions or
- 10 next page?
- 11 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I just want to
- 12 take a pulse of my fellow commissioners. I feel like
- 13 we're getting a lot of really rich detail here. I'm
- 14 assuming it's somewhat redundant to what was talked
- 15 about in the subcommittee, and to what extent we want to
- 16 invite our presenters to continue going through this
- 17 detail or whether we feel we have enough information to
- 18 go back to the matters at hand.
- 19 I'd make a motion to actually wrap this
- 20 presentation up.
- 21 MS. CHORNEAU: I would want to make one other
- 22 comment, though, just about the logistics. Dan had
- 23 mentioned our sister agency at Sacramento State that we
- 24 could use to do logistics. And I don't want to get too
- in the weeds, but we got a list of considerations last

- 1 week, and when we saw that list we thought we could
- 2 really get some efficiencies by bringing in a conference
- 3 specialist, logistics specialist. And we realized last
- 4 night that list is for this type of meeting today,
- 5 so it would be like the full hearing with fourteen
- 6 commissioners, and that price, it's a lot more than what
- 7 we're talking about at a hearing or a workshop.
- 8 In-house we do do logistics for this type of thing that
- 9 we're talking about here. With security and fourteen
- 10 microphones and that kind of stuff, that's when we might
- 11 bring in someone else to do it because there are
- 12 additional needs, if you're talking about the numbers.
- Anyway, in this document that we passed
- 14 out today, which is different than yesterday, we did our
- own estimate for what it would cost if we did the
- 16 logistics. So now that's folded in. Yesterday we
- 17 didn't have the good number for that. So it's changed
- 18 from yesterday and it's in here, and that's the number.
- 19 It wouldn't be more than that to do this type of
- 20 logistics per hearing or workshop, and that's what it
- 21 would be to have us do it. So just to give you that
- 22 number.
- 23 MS. RUBIN: The other thing I just want to
- 24 doublecheck, you two Fridays ago asked us for three
- 25 budget scenarios, and we do have that on the very back

- 1 page. And the issue with those numbers is, because of
- 2 my mistake on the first page, all those numbers need to
- 3 be adjusted accordingly. So I could read those through
- 4 if you want. Okay. And Charlotte will flip us to the
- 5 very last. It's corrected in this document.
- There we go, okay. Mi ni mum approach. So
- 7 the base cost, \$134,944. So this one we call the
- 8 minimum approach, harkening back to Mr. Claypool's not
- 9 knowing, with a total of \$469, 175. And then -- so your
- 10 base costs are going to carry down in all four of these
- 11 options. So the \$134,944.
- So now I'm just going to give you the
- 13 total cost. Option 1 total cost, \$571,900. Option 2
- 14 total cost, \$749, 220. And option 3 total cost \$892, 256.
- 15 So option 3 is the closest to what you were talking
- 16 about earlier. That one assumes 36 hearings,
- 17 videotaping one community workshop. And one thing we
- 18 haven't talked about is, although Karin is talking about
- 19 seven workshops and you can hold as many as you want, in
- 20 that proposal there is no workshop being held in the
- 21 north part of the state, and so our recommendation is
- 22 that you add one to the north.
- 23 CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you for your
- 24 presentation.
- 25 Is there any questions directly for CCP

- 1 at this time?
- 2 MS. RUBIN: I'm sorry, there's a real
- 3 important part that we didn't even go over, which is the
- 4 last page, which is a draft scope of work, if you are
- 5 interested in having us help you with your February 26
- 6 workshop. It's a two-pager. And on the second page the
- 7 printer only printed three fourths of the page. The
- 8 total at the bottom of the page is \$9,936. That's what
- 9 those three figures add to, \$9936. So if you want, I
- 10 can go over this. It's up to you.
- 11 CHAIRMAN WARD: Is there any further questions
- 12 at this time?
- 13 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: So, Sarah, you're ready
- 14 to go in terms of this outline here and you can actually
- 15 do this on February 26?
- 16 MS. RUBIN: I'm sorry, I don't know why, but I
- 17 can't hear you.
- 18 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: So this proposal here for
- 19 February 26, you're saying for \$9,936 you folks are
- 20 prepared to go forward and actually do this?
- 21 MS. RUBIN: Exactly. We knew you would need
- 22 time to consider the big proposal, and actually if you
- 23 want a refined proposal, as you talked about earlier, we
- 24 need more direction from you because we don't know what
- 25 you want. So we would need a refined request to give

- 1 you a definitive sense of the big picture. But this
- 2 just helps you if you would like our assistance between
- 3 now and February 26. That's what this is.
- 4 MS. CHORNEAU: Well, just that there's a
- 5 couple items on here. So there's continuing to develop
- 6 the process for the broader outreach effort that's
- 7 included here, and then facilitation/support on the 26th
- 8 which would include coordinating with those groups that
- 9 have been invited, making sure that they're organized
- 10 and ready to go and making sure that that day goes well
- and is organized and everyone has all the information
- 12 that they need to prepare.
- And then the last one, which I think is
- 14 the first one on here, is what I mentioned earlier about
- 15 that broader assessment. We would like, or we would
- 16 recommend that if you were to do that you would start
- 17 it, that you could announce it. It could already be up
- 18 and running when you hold that meeting on the 26th. So
- 19 we could draft that and get that going before. So
- 20 that's what we're including in the scope of work and the
- 21 budget.
- 22 MS. RUBIN: And we're a little uncomfortable
- 23 going forward with our full process design without
- 24 getting more feedback from the public.
- 25 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Parvenu?

- 1 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: This is very ambitious,
- 2 and thank you for the good work you put into this. This
- 3 of course includes outreach to media outlets? I know
- 4 that some newspapers and publications require two-week
- 5 deadlines.
- 6 Please, Mr. Wilcox.
- 7 MR. WILCOX: Yes, that's part of the my job in
- 8 the role of our communications outreach and strategy.
- 9 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Thank you.
- 10 COMMISSIONER YAO: First of all, on supporting
- 11 the February 26 meeting, the public has brought to my
- 12 attention that each of the columns, the additions don't
- 13 add up. So I know it's a minor adjustment, but you may
- 14 want to take a look at that.
- 15 Secondly is your one-time fixed cost.
- 16 Don't you have to do that before February 26?
- MS. RUBIN: We wouldn't be planning on it, no.
- 18 COMMISSIONER YAO: So without doing all the
- 19 preparation of the material, what is it that you're
- 20 going to do on February 26?
- 21 MS. CHORNEAU: Yeah, the design would be
- 22 different than the other public hearings that we were
- 23 talking about up here. It would be what Karin is kind
- 24 of referring to as a statewide hearing. The notice has
- 25 actually gone out to invite groups that are engaged in

- 1 outreach, on-the-ground outreach, and it doesn't have to
- 2 be people that are statewide. It could be anyone. It's
- 3 open to anyone to respond to the invitation, is come and
- 4 give a presentation, a structured presentation on what
- 5 they're doing, and give you that feedback. So the
- 6 design would be different. The focus would be
- 7 different. Anyone could make any public comment, as
- 8 they can here today, but that would be the design focus
- 9 and that's what we would explain to the public or in
- 10 your notices and speaking with people.
- 11 COMMISSIONER YAO: Not to belabor the point,
- 12 does the subcommittee understand the differences between
- 13 the February 26 meeting and any subsequent meetings such
- 14 that we can learn something from the February 26
- 15 meeting? Just from what I heard, it sounds like we
- 16 haven't done the real presentation, or the prep work for
- 17 the training or outreach because we would not incur any
- 18 of the one-time cost. So what we're doing on February
- 19 26 is going to be completely different than everything
- 20 else. What is it that we're going to try to learn from
- 21 the February 26 meeting is really the question I have
- 22 for the subcommittee.
- 23 CHAIRMAN WARD: I'd like to, because of the
- 24 late hour, refer subcommittee questions. We'll table
- 25 those until tomorrow for further discussion with the

- 1 subcommittee.
- 2 But any questions directly for CCP, let's
- 3 go ahead and get those out now because I don't believe
- 4 they will be with us tomorrow.
- 5 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I just want to clarify.
- 6 So the actual -- besides the survey, the tasks for the
- 7 next meeting would be developing the description of the
- 8 information requested, and that would be working with
- 9 whom? With us or with -- how will you get the
- 10 information that you're going to be describing?
- 11 MS. CHORNEAU: Well, we would be using our
- 12 best judgment of assessment questions, the baseline kind
- 13 of general questions about how would you like the
- 14 Commission to engage, how would you like to see this
- 15 outreach effort going, and what have you been doing on
- 16 the ground thus far to describe.
- 17 But we would certainly be willing and
- 18 hopeful that we could work with at least members of the
- 19 outreach subcommittee to develop those questions in that
- 20 structure and be working with Karin, is what our
- 21 assumption was, but actually for this I don't know if we
- 22 would need to, and coordination with staff and the
- 23 commissioners that we met with from the outreach
- 24 subcommittee.
- 25 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And then the second task

- 1 would be the outreach, correct?
- 2 MS. RUBIN: Exactly, the preparation and
- 3 facilitation of that meeting. So when you look at the
- 4 numbers for task 2, that assumes a ten-hour meeting day.
- 5 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Oh, I'm not looking at
- 6 cost. I'm just trying to answer the question of what
- 7 goes into the prep for this meeting. So it's outreach
- 8 to organizations.
- 9 MS. RUBIN: Yes.
- 10 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: This then designing the
- 11 structure.
- MS. RUBIN: Exactly. We really want to think
- 13 through what all do you want to know. How might all of
- 14 the presentations be set. Could we set up a template
- 15 that we could share with all of the organizations, so as
- 16 you listen to six, eight, fifteen presentations might
- 17 there be a little bit of the structure so that they're
- 18 providing you with the information in a somewhat similar
- 19 way. It would be a suggestion. You can't require
- 20 anyone to do it in any specific way. But that way it's
- 21 back to apples and apples, and it helps you take in the
- 22 information. And we hope that would help to streamline
- 23 and create some efficiencies in the way the day would
- 24 run so it would be nice and smooth.
- 25 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think this is a very

- 1 good point that Commissioner Blanco brings up. And
- 2 again, it goes back to playing to the strength of each
- 3 of the contractors. CCP, as you can see from what
- 4 they've presented, does a really good job of structuring
- 5 what needs to be done.
- 6 One of the key elements, again, is the
- 7 content, as they had said, and that has to come from a
- 8 technical aspect. With this meeting on the 26th maybe
- 9 not quite as much. But, again, in order for them to
- 10 know what they need to ask the participants at the
- 11 statewide meeting to a big degree has to come from the
- 12 technical side, and it to some degree would also be nice
- to have some VRA input, too, but I know we're limited.
- 14 But for the February 26th meeting it's maybe not quite
- 15 as critical. But I think as you move forward,
- 16 particularly in the input hearings, I have no doubt that
- 17 CCP could implement all of this and really coordinate it
- 18 all. But the content has to come from the other
- 19 consul tants.
- 20 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: For the benefit of
- 21 those who were not at the subcommittee meeting yesterday
- 22 and for the audience and those viewing via web, I
- 23 understand that your intention is still to use some of
- 24 the contacts and resources you established during the
- 25 census outreach effort.

1	MS. CHORNEAU: Yes.
2	CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Filkins Webber?
3	COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Since the focus
4	of the meeting would be to encourage and reach out to
5	those particular organizations that obviously have
6	participated in civil engagement, what's the purpose of
7	the survey?
8	MS. RUBIN: The survey would actually be
9	different. The idea is setting up the survey for the
10	general public. So the reason it's two tasks is because
11	it's two completely different things. The survey idea
12	is you put something out so that any person you live
13	in a rural area, you live in Los Angeles, anywhere cross
14	the state. What Mr. Wilcox was saying: reaching every
15	Californian. It provides every single Californian the
16	opportunity to say, "Commission, here's how I'd like you
17	to communicate with me and how I'd like you to engage
18	when you come to my community."
19	COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I understand
20	that for your original proposal. I just mean for
21	Saturday, the 26th, what's the purpose for this limited
22	scope of work for the survey, given that we're
23	essentially soliciting those that are well seasoned in
24	civil engagement? So what would be the purpose for your
25	proposal at the cost that you put on here? And

- 1 obviously it's limited, \$1,704, but I don't understand
- 2 the purpose yet.
- 3 MS. RUBIN: I'm sorry. It's late. Maybe I'm
- 4 not being articulate.
- 5 It's two, really, separate things. What
- 6 we have down as task 1 has nothing to do with the 26th.
- 7 It has to do with the big picture, big package outreach,
- 8 and we're basically saying you can't wait to start that
- 9 assessment. And we are also thinking that on the 26th
- 10 it would be really nice for you to be able to announce
- 11 publically: "Every Californian, there's a survey tool
- 12 out there. We can mail it to you. You can go on the
- 13 web. We want to hear what you have to say." It would
- 14 provide you with that opportunity, so that you'd be
- 15 ready. And the way people said earlier today you want
- 16 to be moving forward, it would let you move forward with
- 17 that piece.
- 18 MS. CHORNEAU: And by doing it in that open
- 19 fashion it's not excluding anyone that maybe hasn't been
- 20 engaged. So the theme is the same. It's getting
- 21 information. The groups that might come and present on
- 22 the 26th are groups that are already engaged, we would
- 23 assume, because they're going to be reporting on what
- 24 they're doing. The assessment tool, the survey tool is
- intended to reach anyone who would like to participate

- 1 on that who may or may not have been engaged up until
- 2 now.
- 3 MS. RUBIN: And once you've got it up, then it
- 4 would be the job of your communications director to
- 5 really be getting the message out every single place
- 6 possible: throughout your traditional media, ethnic
- 7 media, radio, TV, print, to say this survey is out
- 8 there; we want to hear what you have to say.
- 9 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: One follow-up
- 10 question in that regard. What's the difference between
- 11 the three hours that you have for this limited purpose
- 12 for development of this survey versus the 30 hours that
- 13 you have on your one-time fixed cost? What's the
- 14 di fference?
- 15 MS. CHORNEAU: It's taking -- it's in this
- 16 budget, so we're saying --
- 17 Ri ght?
- 18 It's the same 30 hours. It would just be
- 19 incurred between now and the 26th. It's taking it right
- 20 out of there. We wouldn't do it twice. We would only
- 21 do it once and it just so happens that we're
- 22 recommending it be done between now and the 26th, which
- 23 is when we assumed you would consider the full --
- 24 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: So --
- MS. RUBIN: But we were also thinking -- I'm

- 1 sorry. Let me add on to Charlotte.
- 2 So you could subtract some time from
- 3 this. But in the big picture, the one with the 30
- 4 hours, the idea is over time you want to keep surveying
- 5 people. One thing Karin's talked about, for example, is
- 6 having some flexible meetings held back after you come
- 7 out with maps. So say you're like, okay, we're going to
- 8 do five new flexible meetings. You might want to survey
- 9 people about where those should be. So that would be an
- 10 opportunity to do a new survey.
- 11 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Thank you.
- 12 CHAIRMAN WARD: Mr. Miller?
- 13 MR. MILLER: Mr. Chair, if I could have leave
- 14 to ask one question since time is short.
- 15 Could you comment for us on the
- 16 qualitative difference between the minimum approach and
- 17 the option 3 approach? What would the Commission be
- 18 getting and giving up between those two, as it's about a
- 19 \$500,000 spread.
- 20 MS. RUBIN: Okay. So in the minimum approach
- 21 you do one workshop. You don't do the seven that
- 22 Karin's talked about consecutively with her centers; you
- 23 only do one. But we assume you videotape it. And then
- 24 for the hearings you would do 18 hearings total, so that
- 25 assumes you go to each region, if you're nine regions,

- 1 one time before maps are drawn and one time after maps
- 2 are drawn. And that's it. Those are the only public
- 3 hearings you would hold during this whole process, one
- 4 in each region before maps and one in each region after
- 5 maps. We do still assume that you do six conference
- 6 calls or webinars to give people an opportunity to
- 7 comment.
- 8 Whereas in option 3 we've got eight
- 9 workshops. That's the seven Karin proposes plus one
- 10 we're suggesting in the north of the state. You still
- 11 videotape one educational workshop, and then you have 36
- 12 hearings. So you could divide those however you want,
- 13 but in that case you've got two in each region pre-map
- 14 and two in each region post-map, and then still the six
- 15 webinars or conference calls. So I think this is still
- 16 less than what you were talking about a little earlier.
- 17 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: On the options that have
- 18 more hearings, what -- you keep the webinar calls at the
- 19 same number throughout the options.
- 20 MS. RUBIN: Right. You could take those off
- 21 if you want. You don't have to do conference calls.
- 22 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Because that -- yeah.
- 23 MS. RUBIN: Yes, absolutely.
- I guess the last thing I would add on the
- 25 webinar, one reason we have those in is, from our phone

- 1 interviews we really heard loud and clear from your
- 2 partners on the ground that there's a lot of people out
- 3 there who will not have the ability to come to
- 4 something, even if it's at night or on the weekends,
- 5 some people with mobility issues. There are folks who
- 6 work two jobs and have three kids and it's just not
- 7 realistic for them. And there's people in rural places
- 8 where they just can't drive five hours or even three
- 9 hours. It's cost-prohibitive and time-prohibitive for
- 10 them. And the conference call, it provides the
- opportunity for anyone anywhere if you have a phone to
- 12 at least get the information. It's not really
- 13 interactive. You're really only giving information, but
- 14 at least you've communicated.
- 15 CHAIRMAN WARD: Any further questions for CCP
- 16 at this time?
- 17 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Just one final
- 18 question. This might be an unreasonable question to
- 19 ask, but, based on your experience in conducting
- 20 workshops like this, getting back to the February 26th
- 21 engagement, what do you think a realistic expectation of
- 22 a turnout would be? I know we have to do media. We
- 23 have to do a lot of other up-front activity in terms of
- 24 getting the word out. And since we'll be in Sacramento,
- you're based in Sacramento, your knowledge of Sacramento

- 1 and that community, what would you expect at least?
- 2 MS. CHORNEAU: You mean for groups giving
- 3 presentations or just groups in the audience?
- 4 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Yes, groups giving
- 5 presentations.
- 6 MS. RUBIN: Oh, for the 26th.
- 7 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: For the 26th only.
- 8 MS. RUBIN: It would be between 12 and 25.
- 9 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: That's a reasonable
- 10 range.
- 11 MS. RUBIN: Because, you know, the California
- 12 Redistricting Alliance, I think there's at least 12 or
- 13 14 groups on that.
- 14 MS. CHORNEAU: I would say at least ten.
- 15 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Thanks for the
- 16 estimate.
- 17 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: I might add, as a
- 18 member of the outreach committee, the discussions that
- 19 we had with these individuals, Karin or Charlotte and
- 20 Sarah, involved talking about philosophies, talking
- 21 about approach and logistics. And ultimately what we
- 22 asked them for was give us the information, especially
- 23 the budget, in a format that can be easily grasped and
- 24 where it would be in a menu format so we could quickly
- 25 deduct some items or lessen the intensity of the process

- 1 itself.
- 2 So I just want to recognize Charlotte and
- 3 Sarah for, I thought, doing an excellent job with this,
- 4 minus the math, but that's all right.
- 5 But ultimately it comes down to a basic
- 6 approach and then three options, some that are, quote
- 7 unquote, richer than others in terms of community civic
- 8 engagement. So I thought that the format was very
- 9 comprehensive and easy to understand.
- 10 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: I just want to comment
- 11 exactly what Commissioner Aguirre said. So Sarah and
- 12 Charlotte, thank you very much. You followed through on
- 13 a lot of the comments that were made at our
- 14 subcommittee. So essentially you gave us a grocery list
- 15 from which we can pick and choose. And this is well
- 16 done.
- 17 MS. RUBIN: So, given the late hour, can we
- 18 make the assumption that tomorrow you will decide if you
- 19 want us to give you a refined proposal and then what
- 20 that will include so that we will have direction?
- 21 CHAIRMAN WARD: We'll discuss that
- 22 momentarily.
- 23 Is there anymore questions from the
- 24 Commi ssi on?
- 25 COMMISSIONER YAO: Again, I want to thank you

- 1 for providing us that shopping list of data. That
- 2 really is very helpful, especially in light of my
- 3 difficulty throughout the whole day in terms of trying
- 4 to bracket the cost.
- 5 One thing, maybe it's unfair for me to
- 6 ask you but probably should be asked of the
- 7 subcommittee, is, the public talked about having some
- 8 regional organizations to assist us in doing a lot of
- 9 the training, so maybe one additional bit of input I
- 10 would welcome is the cost for training the trainer so
- 11 that we have qualified people that will be out there to
- 12 basically make the same kind of presentation. Not so
- 13 much for the hearing, but for the initial workshop.
- So, again, I don't want to ask this
- 15 directly because I think they should continue to work
- 16 through the subcommittee, but I want the subcommittee to
- 17 hear my request.
- 18 MS. CHORNEAU: And I can just mention briefly
- 19 that -- I may not have articulated it well enough. That
- 20 was the intention of the workshop model. It's something
- 21 that, when you give them a toolkit, it's something that
- 22 community organizers can take out and do themselves and
- 23 do that kind of community organizing themselves without
- 24 it in the infrastructure of a workshop. So it was
- 25 something that we would have. The whole toolkit would

- 1 include information, talking points, and a way to make
- 2 an agenda, you know, those types of things, so they
- 3 could go out and do it themselves.
- 4 MS. RUBIN: And I would just add, because we
- 5 rushed a little bit because of the time, we skipped over
- 6 that. But it wouldn't just be community organizers.
- 7 The approach with the toolkit would be anyone, so that
- 8 if my direct neighbor dragged me to go to that meeting
- 9 I'd be like, "Oh, this is really interesting," and then
- 10 I could take that and take it back to, say, my school
- 11 community and try to get them organized, or whoever you
- 12 want.
- 13 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Aguirre?
- 14 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes. And I might
- 15 attest to the value of this model that they just
- 16 presented, given the experience of census 2010 where
- 17 they in fact set up that toolkit and really went out and
- 18 leveraged partners that were already out there and were
- 19 interested in the census itself. And it really
- 20 provided -- being a local guy in a small town, it really
- 21 provided a format for individuals that didn't really
- 22 know a lot about the minutia to be understood about
- 23 census, understood that there was one objective, and
- 24 that was to go out and register folks into the census
- and make sure that that vote was counted.

- 1 So I like the model. It proved itself
- 2 well. One question about workshops and how many folks
- 3 can you expect at these hearings, whatever, they pulled
- 4 about an average of 300 individuals to reach 20
- 5 workshops.
- 6 CHAIRMAN WARD: At this time I'd like to thank
- 7 CCP for their presentation. Thank you so much. The
- 8 handouts were fantastic and we appreciate all the effort
- 9 and time you put into being -- and patience with us
- 10 today.
- 11 So as a Commission I'd like to get a
- 12 pulse. The first thing we need to know is how many
- 13 commissioners are not going to be here tomorrow? Would
- 14 you raise your hands, please, if you're not going to be
- 15 here tomorrow.
- 16 (Rai se of hands.)
- 17 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
- 18 Forbes is raising his hand.
- 19 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So have it be known
- 20 that both Stan and I are off tomorrow. You can not
- 21 achi eve a supermaj ori ty.
- 22 CHAIRMAN WARD: We still have a quorum but we
- 23 won't be able to vote on anything requiring a
- 24 supermajority.
- 25 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: I'll be here in the

- 1 morning but I need to leave for a commitment in the
- 2 afternoon. So I should be in and out.
- 3 CHAIRMAN WARD: Okay. So, then, we have a few
- 4 items I believe that require a supermajority vote, so
- 5 those will need to be accomplished tonight.
- 6 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: Yes. So being that it's
- 7 past 6:30, I don't think the outreach committee is
- 8 prepared to go on. Ran out of gas. But I do think that
- 9 first thing in the morning we should talk about the
- 10 timeline and tighten this package up so that we can make
- 11 these decisions.
- 12 CHAIRMAN WARD: What I would ask of the
- 13 subcommittee is, were there action items that required a
- 14 Commission vote this week?
- 15 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: No, there's no action
- 16 items. I think Commissioner DiGuilio actually forced a
- 17 number of issues that would have come up in our
- 18 subcommittee meeting as well. The number of hearings,
- 19 the number of hearings for the educational piece, all of
- 20 these were addressed earlier. So what we want to
- 21 discuss tomorrow is how that all fits in in a very tight
- timeline.
- COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Do you want to go to
- 24 work on the 26th? Can we authorize that? Would that be
- okay with the subcommittee, have them work with us?

- 1 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: Yes, actually. Yes, that
- 2 would be our recommendation.
- 3 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: So in that regard I
- 4 would move that we authorize them to work on the scope
- 5 of work as outlined in their proposal so that we can in
- 6 fact carry out our objective of having our first hearing
- 7 in Sacramento.
- 8 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Point of
- 9 clarification. Which proposal?
- 10 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: The February. Is it
- 11 the 26th? That proposal.
- 12 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I second that motion.
- 13 CHAIRMAN WARD: Okay, we have a motion on the
- 14 floor. It's been seconded. Any comment from
- 15 commissioners?
- 16 COMMISSIONER DAI: Just to clarify, this is
- 17 the one -- this is the two-pager, just for that.
- 18 CHAIRMAN WARD: Not seeing any comments, I'd
- 19 like to open it up for the public to comment on the
- 20 motion on the floor.
- Nobody approaching the microphone, we'll
- 22 go ahead and take a vote. All in favor of the motion,
- 23 please raise your hand and state "yes."
- 24 COMMISSION MEMBERS: Yes.
- 25 CHAIRMAN WARD: Any opposed?

1	And any abstentions?
2	And motion so moved.
3	Commissioner DiGuilio, did you have any
4	comment? Okay, I didn't know if there was anything else
5	from technical that you knew needed to get accomplished.
6	COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: Well, we do need to
7	make some decisions as to how we're going to move
8	forward with the technology consultant.
9	CHAIRMAN WARD: So this is the motion the Vice
10	Chair made?
11	COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: I believe we can
12	revisit that.
13	CHAIRMAN WARD: Sounds great. Would you like
14	to restate that motion, please?
15	COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: The motion that
16	I withdrew that I will reintroduce now, which was that
17	we contract with Q2 and CCP to get underway our
18	educational meetings and community workshops only and
19	that the remainder of our outreach and input strategy
20	will go out to competitive bid.
21	COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: And, for
22	clarification, that does not require a sole provider
23	contract.
24	COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: I'll second that
25	motion.

- 1 CHAIRMAN WARD: Excellent. We have a motion.
- 2 It's been seconded. Any comment from the Commission?
- 3 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Yes. One
- 4 comment that was made by Ms. Mac Donald earlier, even
- 5 though she didn't spell it out, and the only concern
- 6 that I have at this point is she did give some
- 7 consideration to the possibility that this could
- 8 increase our costs and expenses. So in the interest of
- 9 being fiscally responsible, I am a little concerned that
- 10 when we are breaking up these contracts, as much as
- 11 we're enthusiastic and we really do want to proceed and
- 12 I did appreciate and like what package she put together,
- 13 it's something that we need to consider, whether we do
- 14 want to break out these contracts.
- She had mentioned \$3,000. I don't know
- 16 if that's an accurate statement of what she would
- 17 propose for the educational and input. And your motion
- 18 also has now included CCP and we didn't have that
- 19 previously. And, again, I don't know where the
- 20 breakdown for costs would be for consideration of your
- 21 motion.
- 22 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I'm sorry. I
- 23 believe -- let me just check my email. I believe Karin
- 24 sent something in regards to -- did she not say it was
- 25 about \$3,000 for the -- I'm sorry, maybe I should look

- 1 at that first. She had some budget that was associated
- 2 with meetings. I'll look.
- COMMISSIONER DAI: I think it was \$3,000 plus
- 4 expenses.
- 5 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I understood that to be
- 6 the meetings in excess of the ones that she felt were
- 7 already funded by Irvine, and that was a cost per
- 8 meeting, correct.
- 9 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Correct.
- 10 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: But based on the
- 11 motion as phrased, we have the inclusion of CCP without
- 12 any specification regarding their outline for -- I mean
- 13 there is this large budget, so I don't know if --
- 14 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I think they did submit
- 15 the budget just for that hearing.
- 16 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I understand
- 17 that. We've already passed that. What I'm talking
- 18 about is the motion that's presently on the floor, which
- 19 you had added CCP for educational workshops and the
- 20 input hearings, and I don't know if that's their entire
- 21 budget that they have here, which I don't think it is
- 22 given that they've asked us to consider this. So
- 23 don't know if we need to -- because of the manner in
- 24 which you've proposed your motion and included CCP now,
- 25 it just makes it a little bit more difficult to

- 1 determine cost for their aspect if everybody has
- 2 clarification as to what Ms. Mac Donald had proposed for
- 3 that portion.
- 4 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'd like to
- 5 amend my motion, taking into account that feedback, and
- 6 separate out so that my motion is to enter into a
- 7 contract with Q2 specifically to do the educational
- 8 meetings as we decided in our regional strategy.
- 9 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: I second that motion.
- 10 CHAIRMAN WARD: Is that a second,
- 11 Commissioner Aguirre?
- 12 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes.
- 13 COMMISSIONER WARD: Commissioner Aguirre
- 14 seconded that motion. We have an amended motion we have
- 15 to consider first, and that's to contract with Q2 for
- 16 the educational portion.
- 17 Any other comment from the Commission?
- 18 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes.
- 19 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Dai?
- 20 COMMISSIONER DAI: I just want to clarify that
- 21 it is a sole source contract but just for the
- 22 educational portion.
- 23 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: For the
- 24 educational and for the first statewide input hearing
- 25 that will be happening on the 26th of February. So the

1	COST
2	COMMISSIONER DiGUILLO: This is the email that
3	Karin had sent regarding the budget. It says:
4	Regarding a budget for the
5	educational events, we have already
6	budgeted for four of those through
7	Irvine
8	So that would leave each additional
9	one so that would be, what, three to four if we do
10	CCP.
11	I'm assuming two mappers and one
12	assistant, one expert trainer for
13	eight hours, including travel time. I
14	guess that would come to about \$3,000
15	in cost per educational event for the
16	tech training workshop, and the
17	outreach people will do the rest.
18	So three or four, yeah.
19	COMMISSIONER DAI: I have a question. So
20	would we need mappers at this February 26 event?
21	COMMISSIONER BLANCO: No.
22	COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: I'm assuming it would
23	reduce those expenses, though I would be curious to talk
24	to Karin as to why she thought we may have a need for
25	mappers.

- 1 COMMISSIONER YAO: Question. If Karin has the
- 2 first three, four meetings covered by the Irvine
- 3 Foundation, what is the rush for us to approve the
- 4 balance of the meeting tonight?
- 5 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: One of the things we
- 6 heard today was we needed to finalize what it is in the
- 7 way of technical input that we want to talk about and
- 8 get information on. And that's what's been prepared,
- 9 and we have to access that resource. And I don't think
- 10 we're talking about that much money. But this, again,
- is something's we've got to move on because otherwise
- we're going to delay everything one more time.
- 13 COMMISSIONER YAO: No. Again, I'm asking for
- 14 clarification. She quoted about \$3,000 per meeting, and
- 15 since the Irvine Foundation has funded the first four
- 16 meetings, or approximately half the meeting, so I need
- 17 to understand as to what is it that we're trying to
- 18 accomplish with this motion, making a decision right at
- 19 this point in time. Is it that without our commitment
- 20 for the balance of the meeting she can't hold the first
- 21 three, four meetings?
- 22 I'm not against it. I'm just trying to
- 23 understand as to what is it that we're trying to decide.
- 24 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I think I understand,
- just because I know a little bit about the Irvine

- 1 process and the centers. These meetings at the centers
- 2 that have been set up are not going to be our meetings.
- 3 They have these centers. They're going to be doing
- 4 ongoing -- scheduling trainings for people to come to
- 5 those community centers at different times, et cetera.
- 6 So I'm not sure that -- and I'm not sure
- 7 why she stated it like that, because my understanding is
- 8 this would be our educational meeting, not the ones that
- 9 the groups are putting together with money from Irvine
- 10 that they've got a budget and a space for. So I am
- 11 confused about that language. But my understanding is
- 12 that these are our educational meetings held, sponsored
- 13 by the Citizens Redistricting Commission and not the
- ones that she's doing with other groups.
- 15 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And my
- 16 understanding of how she was thinking about it was that
- 17 they were an expansion, that we'd be essentially getting
- 18 a two for one, that it would include and be able to
- 19 maximize some of the resources from the
- 20 Irvine Foundation, but that it would be a
- 21 redistricting -- an official event that we would be
- 22 putting on.
- 23 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: And what I gathered
- 24 from her comments also is that these centers are
- 25 relatively small and so certainly not the type of

- 1 workshops that we would like to have, which would be --
- 2 have broader public participation. Also, I think what
- 3 we're approving is the opportunity for her to
- 4 collaborate with CCP in structuring the educational
- 5 workshops and really trying to assure that they run
- 6 smoothly and that they will in fact lead into some
- 7 requirements of map-drawing information that, whatever
- 8 consultant comes along and we hire, that that
- 9 information will be workable and acceptable.
- 10 COMMISSIONER YAO: If that's the message, can
- 11 you clarify the motion so it reflects exactly what
- 12 Commissioner Aguirre has said?
- 13 CHAIRMAN WARD: Perhaps if we have an amended
- 14 motion? Can we get that one back?
- 15 MS. SARGIS: The motion is to enter into a
- 16 sole source contract with Q2 to get the workshop to
- 17 begin working on the educational meetings and workshops
- 18 only. And I believe you added also the first statewide
- 19 hearing on the 26th, and that the remainder of the work
- would go out to bid.
- 21 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I believe maybe
- 22 we should add a clause there around "in collaboration
- 23 with CCP" so that's clear that this is our team that
- 24 will be moving forth the educational and the first
- 25 statewide input meeting.

- 1 Does that answer your question,
- 2 Commissioner Yao?
- COMMISSIONER YAO: I believe so. But if we
- 4 spell out CCP and we don't have anything going with CCP
- 5 under any other contracts, that's probably problematic.
- 6 But if it's just change it to "with vendors," then I
- 7 think that will be very clean.
- 8 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay. That's
- 9 the amendment I would like to make. So same amendment
- 10 but instead of saying "with CCP," "with other vendors as
- 11 speci fi ed. "
- 12 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: And I would accept that
- amendment.
- 14 CHAIRMAN WARD: Okay. At this point we have a
- 15 motion as just stated and seconded, and I'd like to open
- 16 this up to the public for comment.
- 17 Is there anybody from the public that
- 18 would like to comment on this specific motion?
- 19 AUDI ENCE MEMBER: Douglas Johnson from the
- 20 Rose Institute. First, I want to say thank you for
- 21 opening this up. I welcome the opportunity to talk with
- 22 you more about this through this bid process.
- 23 And I do want to reinforce that I have,
- 24 despite the controversy today, I have a great deal of
- 25 respect for Karin Mac Donald at Q2, and her senior

- 1 business partner there is one of the smartest guys in
- 2 redistricting, Bruce Cain, who is her business partner
- 3 at Q2. So I look forward to the opportunity to talk to
- 4 you more and hopefully to work with her more on this as
- 5 well.
- Thank you very much.
- 7 CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you. Seeing no further
- 8 public comment approaching the microphone, bring it back
- 9 to the Commission. Any last comments?
- 10 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: I have one last comment,
- and that is tomorrow if somebody could lower the
- 12 temperature down. I'm freezing.
- 13 COMMISSIONER YAO: I apologize for that. I
- 14 think, based on the experience yesterday, I made a
- 15 request earlier that they change the temperature. So my
- 16 fault.
- 17 CHAIRMAN WARD: All right. At this point I'd
- 18 like to take a vote on the motion on the floor. If
- 19 you're in favor please raise your hand and say "yes."
- 20 COMMISSION MEMBERS: Yes.
- 21 CHAIRMAN WARD: All opposed?
- 22 Any abstentions?
- Thank you.
- 24 Is there a final technical --
- 25 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I'm sorry, I wasn't

- 1 going to vote on contracts that involved Q2. Sorry. I
- 2 had stated that I would recuse myself.
- 3 CHAIRMAN WARD: Very well. If the record
- 4 could show one abstention from Commissioner Blanco.
- 5 I believe -- is there one last technical
- 6 committee issue? Was there a vote or anything that
- 7 needed to be discussed on RFP?
- 8 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I guess that's a good
- 9 point. Does the Commission want to authorize an RFP for
- 10 the remainder of the technical issues as they relate to
- 11 the public input hearings?
- 12 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And correct me
- 13 if I'm wrong, but we did not enter into any agreements
- 14 around bringing CCP on for the educational meetings. We
- only entered into a contract with them to work on the
- 16 meeting on the 26th.
- 17 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: There may be two
- 18 issues here, too. If we're giving a bid to a technology
- 19 consultant for the educational component, should we do
- 20 the same, then, for CCP? Am I confusing the issue?
- 21 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I believe CCP is a
- 22 State organization, correct?
- 23 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: It's
- interagency.
- 25 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Interagency agreement

- 1 we worked out with them?
- 2 MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes. They're with CSU
- 3 Sacramento, so they're a State --
- 4 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So we could have staff
- 5 to say for them to work together with Karin on -- again,
- 6 taking in the collaborative nature of this process, to
- 7 work together for the actual educational outreach
- 8 meetings. So it goes back to the issue of the input,
- 9 the public input hearings, which will need a technology
- 10 consultant. If we don't want a sole source we need to
- 11 do an RFP for that; is that correct?
- 12 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: -- (i naudi bl e) --
- 13 CHAIRMAN WARD: Yes.
- 14 COMMISSIONER DIGUILLO: We'll have staff go
- 15 ahead and do the RFP for the technology consultants for
- 16 the public input hearings and the map drawing.
- 17 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And is that to come to
- 18 us by the next meeting? Is that what we talked about --
- 19 CHAIRMAN WARD: That was in response to RFP,
- 20 correct?
- 21 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yes.
- 22 CHAIRMAN WARD: Is that the sense of the
- 23 Commission at this point?
- 24 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: That's what I'm trying
- 25 to figure out. I'm trying to clarify that we will have

- 1 something reported back to us by the next --
- 2 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I believe the
- 3 part of my motion which was voted on was that -- the
- 4 second part was that the remainder of the outreach
- 5 strategy was going to go out to competitive bid. So
- 6 then the question is timing, how we will handle that
- 7 bid, not whether it will go out to bid.
- 8 MR. CLAYPOOL: Right. And so, as I understood
- 9 it, when we separated these two out it was to give some
- 10 length on the other end. So the only thing that will be
- 11 involved in this is we will have to put a place number,
- 12 kind of holding a spot in the budget and saying that, as
- 13 Chairman Yao had discussed, it will not exceed this
- 14 amount, without knowing the amount that is the final bid
- 15 from the bidder. Because we have to get this budget in
- 16 front of the -- to finance and in front of the
- 17 legislature for their approval. So that's the nuance.
- 18 That's the nuance.
- 19 So your answer also is, could we be in a
- 20 position to make a presentation at the Sacramento?
- 21 Possibly. I'm hoping we can. But that was one of the
- 22 reasons why when it seemed like we were accelerating it
- 23 I'd asked that we have that second meeting in
- 24 conjunction with the legal committee as, if we need it,
- 25 the Commission could meet in full Commission as a full

- 1 body at that point to look at it, if for some reason we
- 2 couldn't make the presentation by the Sacramento
- 3 meeting.
- 4 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So we would have to have
- 5 that meeting noticed with that item on the agenda for
- 6 the 4th if we tagged it onto the legal committee
- 7 meeting.
- 8 MR. CLAYPOOL: Correct. And so -- and we can
- 9 do -- for that particular meeting we can do it the same
- 10 way we've done many of our meetings. We can say that we
- 11 will have the legal committee, will be meeting,
- 12 subcommittee, but the full Commission may meet if it's
- 13 necessary to address this issue.
- 14 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: So could you maybe
- 15 clarify, then? So we will go out to RFP for this aspect
- and the responses will be reviewed by the legal
- 17 committee? No, I'm sorry.
- MR. CLAYPOOL: So the process will be that we
- 19 will go through the finance and technical committee to
- 20 review our scope of work, and we'll put the scope of
- 21 work together. And they'll comment on that after it's
- 22 gone through our chief counsel. Then we will let that
- 23 proposal, request that the proposals come to us. When
- 24 they're returned we'll compare them and try to make a
- 25 presentation out of what we've received. And then that

- 1 is what we would present to the Commission as this is
- 2 what it looks like; this is what the bids look like.
- 3 And then you would have to make a decision from that
- 4 information.
- 5 COMMISSIONER DAI: Just for clarification,
- 6 Mr. Claypool, because that sounds a little different
- 7 than what I had asked before, which was we had discussed
- 8 putting an RFP out in two to three days using the
- 9 information that Ms. Mac Donald has already prepared,
- 10 and in parallel asking for a shorter contract, you know,
- 11 bidding period, fewer than ten days, with the hope that
- 12 sometime in our currently noticed meeting, February 23rd
- to 27th, that we might actually have responses and be
- 14 able to look at them. That was my understanding. I was
- 15 a little confused because what you just said is that we
- 16 might need this other meeting to review the scope of
- 17 work. I just want clarification on that.
- 18 MR. CLAYPOOL: The clarification -- and I
- 19 apologize. It's late for all of us. The scope of work
- 20 is what we're going to put together first, starting
- 21 tomorrow, in the next couple days, and we'll take it
- 22 past our chief counsel. And then we would give it to
- 23 the technical committee and to the finance committee to
- 24 just review, whoever is designated, make your edits, are
- 25 there things that need to be added. Then we'll send

- 1 that out to get the proposals. When the proposal is
- 2 returned, then it would be staff responsibility to take
- 3 them and give you some type of presentation in full
- 4 committee so that you can make the comparison and make
- 5 your decisions.
- 6 COMMISSIONER DAI: And so, then, the request
- 7 for this additional meeting is just in case we run out
- 8 of time on Sunday, the 27th, and we don't get to that
- 9 item, that we would have the ability to immediately meet
- 10 the following week and make a decision on that.
- MR. CLAYPOOL: Exactly.
- 12 CHAIRMAN WARD: At this point does staff have
- 13 enough information to be directed to get that RFP out
- 14 and that process moving?
- MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes.
- 16 CHAIRMAN WARD: Okay, thank you.
- MR. CLAYPOOL: We're actually started on it.
- 18 CHAIRMAN WARD: Excellent.
- 19 MR. CLAYPOOL: We have one other issue, if I
- 20 might, and I don't know if this is the appropriate time,
- 21 but I do have the salary schedule that we would need to
- 22 elevate to as far as the human relations specialist is
- concerned.
- 24 CHAIRMAN WARD: That would be great.
- 25 COMMISSIONER DAI: The budget officer, right?

- 1 MR. CLAYPOOL: For the budget officer. We had
- 2 Let the salary range at \$4424 to \$5,359, and we, in
- 3 their opinion, would have to increase it to \$6,173 to
- 4 \$6,800 per month in order to find an appropriate
- 5 candi date.
- 6 And then the second bit of information
- 7 that I'd shared with both the Chair and the Vice Chair
- 8 is that Fred Radcliffe with the Secretary of State's
- 9 human resources department had suggested that we might
- 10 be able to get three retired annuitants who would be
- 11 willing to share this position. One of them is a
- 12 contract specialist, one of them is a budget specialist,
- and one of them is a specialist for presentations to the
- 14 legislature. These three people are all willing to
- share the position and just come on and come off as we
- 16 need them. So we're working on that as well. And the
- 17 advantage to that is the budget specialist would already
- 18 have the required designations to do our contract.
- So we will either get one person or we
- 20 will get this hydra, but we'll have a solution.
- 21 COMMISSIONER DAI: So question: Do we have a
- 22 motion on the floor still?
- 23 CHAIRMAN WARD: I'm not aware of one that's
- 24 lingering.
- 25 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: We tabled it. It's now

- 1 open for vote, I think.
- 2 CHAIRMAN WARD: No, there's no open motion
- 3 that I'm aware of on the floor.
- 4 Janeece, can you verify that?
- 5 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: I think we just asked
- 6 staff to do the RFP.
- 7 CHAIRMAN WARD: Staff was directed --
- 8 (i naudi bl e).
- 9 COMMISSIONER YAO: I think that's incorrect.
- 10 I think where we left off was we couldn't make a
- 11 decision as to whether we would approve it or not, and I
- 12 think it was motioned at that point to table it until we
- 13 get the actual number. And now we need to either
- 14 approve it or disapprove it.
- 15 CHAIRMAN WARD: We'll need that motion read
- 16 back.
- 17 MS. SARGIS: This is all happening on the day
- 18 I forgot my glasses.
- 19 Commissioner Yao, let's see. I don't
- 20 have record of a second but I believe that there was a
- 21 motion made by Commissioner Yao to give the executive
- 22 director authority to increase the salary range for the
- 23 budget officer and continue with the hiring process.
- 24 Excuse me, Commissioner Aguirre seconded. And then
- 25 Commissioner Ancheta made a motion to table it until the

- 1 range was available.
- 2 COMMISSIONER DAI: May I amend
- 3 Commissioner Yao's motion to add the new -- to increase
- 4 it to the new level that Mr. Claypool has --
- 5 COMMISSIONER YAO: I'll be happy to second
- 6 that motion.
- 7 CHAIRMAN WARD: Excellent. So we have a
- 8 motion on the floor and seconded. Any comment?
- 9 Open it up to the public? Any public
- 10 comments regarding the specific motion on the floor?
- 11 Very good.
- 12 All in favor of the motion on the floor,
- 13 please raise your hand and say "yes."
- 14 COMMISSION MEMBERS: Yes.
- 15 CHAIRMAN WARD: All those opposed?
- And abstentions? None noticed.
- Any remaining issues from the Commission
- 18 or staff?
- 19 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Move to adjourn.
- 20 COMMISSIONER DAI: Wait. I have a question.
- 21 Do we need a motion to hire CCP? I'm still not clear on
- 22 that. Because all we have approved so far is we have
- 23 hired them for the 26th, and it seems to me that,
- 24 regardless of the fact that it's an interagency
- 25 agreement, it's still staffing. It's a consultant,

- 1 right? We still, I believe, need to have a
- 2 supermajority vote on this.
- 3 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Aguirre?
- 4 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes, my understanding
- 5 as they finished their presentation was that they expect
- 6 to provide a refined budget for us to support their
- 7 proposal and that we would be considering that tomorrow.
- 8 COMMISSIONER DiGUILIO: But if you consider it
- 9 tomorrow you won't have enough people to take a vote.
- 10 So maybe the suggestion is, based on those initial
- 11 numbers, knowing that they'll refine those numbers,
- 12 maybe a calculation, could we look at it, then, based on
- 13 those?
- 14 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: As a member of the
- outreach committee, I felt that, and my previous
- 16 comments, that I'm impressed with the scope of work,
- 17 their level of organization, their background and
- 18 expertise, and I feel comfortable in making a motion to
- 19 contract with them, an interagency agreement.
- 20 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I second it.
- 21 CHAIRMAN WARD: Mr. Claypool?
- MR. CLAYPOOL: We simply need clarification as
- 23 to what level we're hiring them at.
- 24 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Blanco?
- 25 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So tomorrow we will go

- 1 back and look at the --
- 2 CHAIRMAN WARD: Correct, the rest of the
- 3 subcommittee briefing.
- 4 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: My concern is I was very
- 5 impressed with them as well. I'm all for this. I'm not
- 6 sure that I would want everything, even in their minimal
- 7 packet. You know, there are some things that I think we
- 8 should discuss what's really within our budget and what
- 9 do we really need to do our job, you know, just things
- 10 like that. And I just want to make sure that we discuss
- 11 that fully in spite of the fact that we're going to
- 12 contract with them.
- 13 CHAIRMAN WARD: Commissioner Raya?
- 14 COMMISSIONER RAYA: We should also note that
- 15 they did ask for more direction from us so that they
- 16 could make those amendments.
- 17 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And I think that if we
- 18 start to allow them to have conversations with the other
- 19 contractors, that might help them a little bit more,
- 20 too, I would imagine.
- 21 COMMISSIONER DAI: So I wonder -- I mean it
- 22 sounds like this needs more discussion, as they said
- 23 they need more parameters from us. And they've given us
- 24 the menu; we haven't told them what we wanted. I think
- 25 there's a general consensus that, you know, it makes

- 1 sense to work with them.
- 2 My question, I guess, to the outreach and
- 3 technical committees, given that we've already approved
- 4 to go ahead and work with them on the 26th, is that
- 5 enough? Do you need a supermajority vote on anything
- 6 else? I mean my feeling is that the outreach committee
- 7 can continue to work with them to refine the proposal
- 8 and bring us a final version by the next meeting. That
- 9 seems like a way to go.
- 10 CHAIRMAN WARD: Does Mr. Claypool have a
- 11 clarification on that as well?
- MR. CLAYPOOL: No. And actually
- 13 Commissioner Dai has put it correctly. I think that
- 14 what they're expecting is this clarification with the
- 15 subcommittees and to bring a final product to the table
- 16 for the next meeting, because that was the whole idea
- 17 behind putting together the final budget and then having
- 18 the numbers we needed to move forward.
- 19 COMMISSIONER ONTAL: And that's our
- 20 expectation also. I think that's what they believed
- 21 they were going to do. I just wanted to vote forward
- 22 because I think it's a time issue tomorrow. We want to
- 23 try to get them on board as soon as possible. But it is
- their desire to look at it and get some feedback and
- 25 then present it to us at a later time.

1 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: So I'll withdraw my 2 motion. 3 CHAIRMAN WARD: Thank you. 4 Any further business items that require a 5 majority vote that you would like to take up at this 6 time? 7 Seeing nothing, anything from staff? 8 Closing comments? 9 MR. CLAYPOOL: I'm all for going home. 10 CHAIRMAN WARD: For closing, okay. 11 I'd just like to thank the Commission 12 very briefly. You guys are amazing, very deliberative, 13 insightful. And, as long as it's been, I think you all 14 need to be commended on the amazing work that you've 15 accomplished on this long day. We'll see you tomorrow 16 at 9:00 a.m. 17 We would like to open it for public 18 comment. My mistake. 19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just very briefly, a piece 20 of redistricting trivia. Today is the 199th anniversary 21 of Elbridge Gerry signing into place the original 22 gerrymander. I look forward to a year from now when you 23 all have killed the gerrymander in California. 24 CHAIRMAN WARD: Very good. Thank you. 25 Meeting adjourned.

1	(Full Commission meeting adjourned
2	at 7:10 p.m.)
3	-0-
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
2)ss COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)
3	
4	
5	I, SUSAN M. PATTERSON, CSR No. 2448, Certified
6	Shorthand Reporter, certify:
7	That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me
8	at the time and place therein set forth;
9	That the proceedings were recorded stenographically
10	by me and were thereafter transcribed;
11	That the foregoing is a true and correct transcript
12	of my shorthand notes so taken.
13	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws
14	of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
15	Dated this 24th day of February, 2011.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	CUCAN M DATTEDCON C C D NO 2440
21	SUSAN M. PATTERSON, C.S.R. NO. 2448
22	
23	
24	
25	